REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01736 5310

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMD
1901,
JAN-MAY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/methodistreview8351unse_0

THE

METHODIST REVIEW.

83
S.So2.17 pt.1
1901 Jan.-May

(BIMONTHLY.)

VOLUME LXXXIII.—FIFTH SERIES, VOLUME XVII.

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, D.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & PYE

I 206231

CONTENTS OF THE VOLUME.

JANUARY—FEBRUARY.

PAGE

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY: A NEW ALIGNMENT FOR A NEW IDEAL 9
J. C. JACKSON, D.D., Columbus, O.

JONES VERY—A SON OF THE SPIRIT 20
Professor G. M. HAMMELL, D.D., Harriman, Tenn.

SOME QUESTIONS THAT EVOLUTION DOES NOT ANSWER 31
Professor H. W. CONN, Ph.D., Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

WILBERFORCE—A STUDY OF FREEDOM 46
Professor A. B. HYDE, D.D., University of Denver, University Park, Colo.

DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE IN ISLAM 53
Rev. W. M. PATTON, Ph.D., Instructor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

MYSTICISM IN TENNYSON 62
Professor EDWIN MIMS, Trinity College, Durham, N. C.

CHRISTIANITY NOT AN EVOLUTION 72
Rev. M. W. GIFFORD, Ph.D., St. Clair, Mich.

THE UNITY OF HISTORY AND RELIGION IN CHRISTIANITY 80
Professor C. G. SHAW, Ph.D., New York city.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM 92
C. M. COBERN, D.D., Denver, Colo.

BROWNING'S VISION OF OLD AGE 99
Professor C. W. HODELL, Woman's College, Baltimore, Md.

THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE RETRIBUTION 105
C. V. ANTHONY, D.D., San Francisco, Cal.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS 113
Simplicity and Dignity, 115; A Protest against Sacrilege, 119.

THE ARENA 124
Recuperation in Nature: a Suggestion, 124; After the Famine, What? 125.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB 129
A Bibliography of Practical Theology, 129.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH 137
Babylonian Explorations, 137; High Place at Petra, 138.

MISSIONARY REVIEW 141
The Bible in Foreign Mission Fields, 141; The Spread of Mohammedanism, 142.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK 144

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES 150

BOOK NOTICES 157
Bradford's The Age of Faith, 157; White's Character and Characteristics of William Law, 159; Foster's Christian Life and Theology, 162; The Complete Poetical Works of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, 165; Gates's Studies and Appreciations, 167; Mark Twain's The Man that Corrupted Hadleyburg, 169; Cooke's History of the Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 171; Gilman's The Life of James Dwight Dana, 172; MISCELLANEOUS, 175.

MARCH—APRIL.

PAGE

CHARLES H. PAYNE, D.D., LL.D. 177
Rev. W. F. ANDERSON, Sing Sing, N. Y.

SHAKESPEARE'S MEN 190
W. A. QUAYLE, D.D., Indianopolis, Ind.

SCHOLASTIC REALISM AND SOME OF ITS BEQUESTS TO THEOLOGICAL THINKING 214
Professor H. C. SHELDON, D.D., Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.

FAITH AND BELIEF 228
Professor R. B. STEELE, Ph.D., Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill.

SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "DIVINE COMEDY" 232
Rev. J. E. C. SAWYER, D.D., Syracuse, N. Y.

ARISTOTELIANISM IN MODERN THOUGHT; A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY 244
Rev. BENJAMIN YOUNG, Cheyenne, Wyo.

KESWICK AND ITS TEACHING 249
Rev. JAMES MUDGE, D.D., Natick, Mass.

DETLEV VON LILIENCRON—A GERMAN SOLDIER POET 264
Professor R. C. FORD, Ph.D., Munich, Germany.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL 269
Rev. J. B. KENYON, Ph.D., Syracuse, N. Y.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS 285
Stedman's Views and Valuations, 286; French Prospects, 289.

THE ARENA 295
Is Christianity in a State of Decline or of Transition? 295; "The Religion of Childhood," 296; Atheism No Disproof of Immortality, 298.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB 299
The Problems of the Twentieth Century for the Ministry, 299; The Homiletic Value of the Late Revision of the Scriptures—Rom. i, 14, 15, 301.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH 304
Higher Criticism and Kindred Things, 304.

MISSIONARY REVIEW 308
The Early Success of Christianity in Japan, 308; Dutch Missions among the Boers, 309.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK 311

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES 317

BOOK NOTICES 321
Hastings's A Dictionary of the Bible, 321; Farrar's The Life of Lives, 323; Hendrix's Skilled Labor for the Master, 326; Peabody's Jesus Christ and The Social Question, 328; Stedman's An American Anthology, 330; Pfleiderer's Evolution and Theology, 333; Chadwick's Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer, 336; Stevens's Supplementary History of American Methodism, 339; Jackson's Huldreich Zwingli, 341; MISCELLANEOUS, 342.

MAY-JUNE.

PAGE

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.. 345
Bishop J. F. HURST, LL.D., Washington, D. C.

THE MUSIC OF THE BIBLE 359
H. G. SIMPSON, Los Angeles, Cal.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY PREACHER..... 374
A. H. TUTTLE, D.D., East Orange, N. J.

AN INDICTMENT AGAINST MORMONISM..... 388
G. E. ACKERMAN, D.D., Chattanooga, Tenn.

MISCELLANEOUS PROTESTANT BLUNDERS..... 401
C. C. STARBUCK, Andover, Mass.

ALEXANDER SMITH AND THE "LIFE DRAMA"..... 418
JOSEPH LUCCOCK, D.D., Chillicothe, O.

JOHN WESLEY, CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST..... 426
W. H. Meredith, D.D., Boston, Mass.

THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF BAPTISM 440
Professor A. W. PATTEN, D.D., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.. 452
The Suicide of God, 454; Professor Winchester on the Golden Age of New England Literature, 456.

THE ARENA 465
"The Religion of Childhood"—W. R. Goodwin's Criticism, 465; A Word for Lucian, 466; "What Created God?" 468.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB..... 469
The Preservation of Intellectual Vigor in the Pulpit, 469; The Homiletic Value of the Late Revision—II. Rom. ii, 12, 13; iii, 20, 471.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH..... 474
Cretan Discoveries, 474; The United States and Archæology, 476; American School at Jerusalem, 477.

MISSIONARY REVIEW 478
The Missionary as a Pacificator in China, 478; Religion of Students in Japan, 480; The Distribution of Wealth, 481.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK..... 482

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES..... 487

BOOK NOTICES 491
Gordon's The New Epoch for Faith, 491; Smith's Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament, 495; Gamble's Sunday, the True Sabbath of God, 497; Baker's Education and Life, 498; Lecky's The Map of Life, 501; Mead's Modern Methods of Church Work, 504; Rogers's A History of Babylonia and Assyria, 505; Addison's The Clergy in American Life and Letters, 508; MISCELLANEOUS, 512.

JULY–AUGUST.

PAGE

WESLEY'S ORIGINAL AMERICAN JOURNAL 513
Bishop E. R. HENDRIX, D.D., LL.D., Kansas City, Mo.

THE PREACHER AND THE OUT-OF-DOORS 524
D. L. SHARP, S.T.B., Boston, Mass.

METHODS OF STUDYING RELIGION 532
Professor G. A. COE, Ph.D., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

VOLTAIRE'S PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION 548
Professor O. B. SUPER, Ph.D., Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

THE KINSHIP OF THE RELIGIOUS AND POETIC IMPULSES 562
CLIFFORD LANIER, Montgomery, Ala.

THE INTELLECT—ITS FUNCTION IN RELIGION 570
Professor G. S. Innis, Ph.D., D.D., Hamline University, Hamline, Minn.

LITERATURE AS AN ELEMENT IN CHINESE REFORM 581
Professor I. T. Headland, Peking University, Peking, China.

SHALL CHRISTIANITY HAVE A FAIR TRIAL IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY? 592
R. F. BISHOP, D.D., Athens, O.

IS MAN IMMORTAL? THE ANSWER OF SCIENCE 604
C. E. LOCKE, D.D., Buffalo, N. Y.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS 611
Hymns and their Helpfulness, 611; Songs from Vagabondia, 618.

THE ARENA 626
The Pulpit and the Doctrine of Eternal Punishment, 626; "The Religion of Childhood" Restated, 631; "The Religion of Childhood"—A Mother's Argument, 633; Mode of Baptism Still Disputed, 634.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB 635
The Homiletic Value of the Late Revision of the Scriptures—Rom. v, 1, 635; Exegetical Study and Preaching, 637.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH 640
Discoveries in Syria, 640; Hammurabi, 642.

MISSIONARY REVIEW 644
Movement in India, 644; Some Ainu Illustrations of Missionary Perplexities, 645; What to Do with the Natives of South Africa, 646.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK 648

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES 653

BOOK NOTICES 658
The Christian Knowledge Lecture Course's Principles of Religious Education, 658; Bullen's With Christ at Sea, 662; Johnson's The Highest Life, 665; Griggs's The New Humanism, 666; Knowles's On Life's Stairway, 669; Martin's Lucid Intervals, 672; Rhodes's History of the United States, 673; Macgregor's George H. C. Macgregor, M.A., 676; Carus-Wilson's A Woman's Life for Kashmir, 678; MISCELLANEOUS, 679.

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER.

PAGE

THE CLASS MEETING IN METHODISM 681
Bishop J. H. VINCENT, D.D., LL.D., Zurich, Switzerland.

LINCOLN'S POWER OF EXPRESSION 694
R. W. GILDER, LL.D., New York City.

OUR MISSIONARY POLITY 706
Bishop J. M. THOBURN, D.D., LL.D., Bombay, India.

THE MOTHER IN THE CHURCH 716
Mrs. LUCY RIDER MEYER, Chicago, Ill.

A DAY AT OLD TROY 733
Professor W. A. ELLIOTT, Ph.D., Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.

NEEDED, A NEW DIVISION OF GENERAL HISTORY 741
M. V. B. KNOX, D.D., Wahpeton, N. Dak.

APOLOGETIC WORTH OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE 756
Professor W. BRENTON GREENE, Jr., D.D., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

SELF-HELP AND COST AT COLLEGES 773
Professor JAMES MELVIN LEE, Western Reserve Seminary, West Farmington, O.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS 778
Important to Friends of Conference Claimants, 780; The Value of the Human, 782.

THE ARENA 791
Recent Archæology, 791; Methodism and Childhood, 795; Methodism in the Philippines, 799.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB 801
Exegetical Study and Preaching—II, 801; The Homiletic Value of the Late Revision of the Scriptures—Rom. iv, 1, 804.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH 807
Discoveries in the Forum, 807.

MISSIONARY REVIEW 811
Some of the Grounds of Hope, 811; The Modern Jew, 812; Shall We Have a Japan Methodist Church? 814.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK 815

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES 821

BOOK NOTICES 828
The Jewish Encyclopedia, 828; Fremantle's Christian Ordinances and Social Progress, 831; The Twentieth Century New Testament, 833; Whibley's The Pageantry of Life, 834; Woodberry's Heart of Man, 838; Lambros's Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos, 841; Abbott's The Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews, 842; Griffis's Verbeck of Japan: A Citizen of No Country, 844; The Illustrated History of Methodism, 846; MISCELLANEOUS, 848.

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER.

PAGE

CREATION OR DEVELOPMENT 849
Professor H. BAVINCK, S.T.D., Kampen, Holland.

THE PREACHER AND HIS MESSAGE 875
Rev. EDGAR V. DU BOIS, M.A., Delta, Colo.

CHRISTIANITY AND SANITY 883
Professor RAYMOND DODGE, Ph.D., Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

THE MIRACULOUS BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST 891
Professor M. S. TERRY, D.D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

HYMNS AS LITERATURE 903
FREDERIC L. KNOWLES, M.A., Boston, Mass.

THE CAUSE AND CURE OF POVERTY 911
E. B. RANDLE, D.D., Danville, Ill.

A NEW COSMIC SONG 922
Professor CHARLES W. HODELL, Ph.D., Woman's College, Baltimore, Md.

INSPIRATION NOT INVALIDATED BY BIBLICAL CRITICISM 934
G. H. BENNETT, D.D., Woodburn, Ore.

APOTHEOSIS AMONG THE ANCIENTS 941
Professor E. B. LEASE, Ph.D., College of the City of New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS 956
Some Recent Outside Views of Methodism, 957; A Centaur in Regent Street, 959.

THE ARENA 966
The Prophecy of Daniel, 966; "Shall Christianity Have a Fair Trial?" 971.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB 973
Catechism of Ministerial Courtesy, 973; How May the Minister Secure Time for His Many Duties? 975.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH 978
The "Encyclopædia Biblica" and Criticism, 978.

MISSIONARY REVIEW 982
The Christian Movement in Korea, 982; Prohibition of Missionaries in the Soudan, 983.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK 986

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES 991

BOOK NOTICES 995
Simpson's The Fact of Christ, 995; King's Reconstruction in Theology, 998; Coberu's Commentary of the Old Testament, 1001; Drummond's The Habitant, 1003; Counsel upon the Reading of Books, 1006; Stephens's The English Church, from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I, 1009; Stillman's The Autobiography of a Journalist, 1012; MISCELLANEOUS, 1015.

INDEX 1017

VOL. LXXXIII, No. 1. WHOLE No. 447. JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1901. FIFTH SERIES, VOL. XVII, No. 1.

METHODIST REVIEW.

(BIMONTHLY.)

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, L.H.D., Editor.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

I. The Church and Society: A New Alignment for a New Ideal. *J. C. Jackson, D.D., Columbus, O.* 9

II. Jones Very—A Son of the Spirit. *Professor G. M. Hammell, D.D., Harriman, Tenn.* 20

III. Some Questions that Evolution Does Not Answer. *Professor H. W. Conn, Ph.D., Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.* . . 31

IV. Wilberforce—A Study of Freedom. *Professor A. B. Hyde, D.D., University of Denver, University Park, Colo.* 46

V. Death and the Intermediate State in Islam. *Rev. W. M. Patton, Ph.D., Instructor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.* . 58

VI. Mysticism in Tennyson. *Professor Edwin Mims, Trinity College, Durham, N. C.* 62

VII. Christianity Not an Evolution. *Rev. M. W. Gifford, Ph.D., St. Clair, Mich.* 72

VIII. The Unity of History and Religion in Christianity. *Professor G. G. Shaw, Ph.D., New York city.* 80

IX. The Higher Criticism. *C. M. Cobern, D.D., Denver, Colo.* . . 92

X. Browning's Vision of Old Age. *Professor C. W. Hodell, Woman's College, Baltimore, Md.* 99

XI. The Doctrine of Divine Retribution. *C. V. Anthony, D.D., San Francisco, Cal.* 105

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

Notes and Discussions. 113
Simplicity and Dignity, 115; A Protest against Sacrilege, 119.

The Arena. 124
Recuperation in Nature: A Suggestion, 124; After the Famine, What? 125.

The Itinerants' Club. 129
A Bibliography of Practical Theology, 129.

Archæology and Biblical Research 137
Babylonian Explorations, 137; High Place at Petra, 138.

Missionary Review. 141
The Bible in Foreign Mission Fields, 141; The Spread of Mohammedanism, 142.

Foreign Outlook. 144

Summary of the Reviews and Magazines. 150

Book Notices. 157

NEW YORK:
EATON & MAINS.
CINCINNATI:
JENNINGS & PYE.

Subscription Price, Postage Included, $2.50.

[Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]

The Cripple of Nuremberg.

By FELICIA BUTTZ CLARK.

A capital story of Reformation times, picturesque, true to history, and fascinating in interest.

Seventeen illustrations from splendid photographs of scenes in and about the quaint old city of Nuremberg.

8vo. Cloth. $1.25.

Why Not?

By MYRA GOODWIN PLANTZ.

"Methodist young people will find this new story of Mrs. Plantz of special interest, as it deals largely with the 'amusement question.' How the sweet and sensible young folks she writes of settled this much-disputed matter cannot fail to help and uplift the reader. Mrs. Plantz's books deserve to be widely read, for, besides being intensely interesting, the religious spirit pervading them is rarely winning. We cordially commend this book as a holiday gift of attractiveness and value."—*Epworth Herald.*

12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. 90 cents.

Mrs. Cherry's Sister;

Or, Christian Science at Fairfax.

By MINNIE W. BAINES-MILLER.

A pleasing story, presenting a sufficient outline of Christian Science to show its absurdity and its best antidote—divine faith and human love.

12mo. Cloth. 90 cents.

Esther in Maine.

By FLORA LONGFELLOW TURKNETT.

"*Esther in Maine* is a delightful story, describing the journey of a little girl named Esther Thompson to the State of Maine up the Penobscot River, past Mount Katahdin, and through the woods, together with other sights and sports, interesting to the little folks."—*Religious Telescope.*

12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. 90 cents.

Sunday the True Sabbath of God;

Or, Saturday Not the Sabbath of the New Testament.

By Rev. S. W. GAMBLE.

This work contains an answer to the theories of the Seventh-day Adventists, and other "Saturdarians," which cannot be easily gainsaid. "The author's proofs are impregnable."

12mo. Cloth, with chart. $1.

EATON & MAINS, Publishers, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York.
JENNINGS & PYE, Cincinnati, O.

METHODIST REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1901.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY: A NEW ALIGNMENT FOR A NEW IDEAL.

ONE of the most marked phenomena of our times is the vast growth of the Church. In 1800 its membership was but seven per cent of the population. In 1880 it had grown to be over twenty per cent, and in 1890 over twenty-one per cent. The proportion of evangelical Church members to the population was three times as large in 1890 as in 1800. It then aggregated over twenty millions. The estimate now is that in this year, 1900, it will number over twenty-seven millions. Considered as a voting force, in most places it would at least hold the balance of power.

With this vast enlargement of strength a new and enlarged conception of its mission is being imparted to the Church by the Holy Spirit. It is that the reign of God is to be set up here on earth in a regenerated society, in answer to the prayer of Christ, "Thy kingdom come." The Church begins to perceive it is our duty not simply to save the individual, but also the State. We are to model its laws upon Christian lines by electing lawmakers who will legislate according to righteous principles. It is our duty to choose judges, mayors, councilmen, and police directors who shall in truth not bear the sword in vain, but be a terror to evildoers. Then, when these true ministers of God shall have made and enforced good laws, it is our duty to protect them by our ballots from the revenge of the evil-minded at the next election.

To be explicit, in short, it begins to dawn upon the religious consciousness of the Church that it is our duty to take part in

politics, meaning by that word every social movement that has to do with the public welfare. Our duty is indicated and measured by our enlarged ability. "We ought because we can" is the universal rule of moral obligation. It is nothing to the point to argue that the early Church did not consider political affairs to be within its province. Jesus did not in his time directly attempt the abolition of slavery, because his followers were too poor and weak, and to have directly undertaken this work would but have resulted in their destruction. Paul never formally inaugurated a prison-reform movement, because neither in numbers nor influence was the Church of that period adequate to such a task. But when time and numbers gave strength the people of God essayed these duties. And, in like manner, there is laid upon us now, according to our enlarged estate, the obligation to save society as it was not put upon our fathers.

The thought of this article is that these new powers and responsibilities of the Church call for a somewhat new alignment of our forces. Sometimes upon the battlefield, a successful charge upon the enemy's position demands the formation of a new line of battle for attacking another strategic point. This is precisely the present situation of the Church. We have been so successful in wresting individual souls from the grasp of Satan that it has laid upon us the duty of changing somewhat the direction of our front. Our guides are now to "take post," in military phrase, for assault upon the main evils of society. Up to this time the forces and activities of Methodism, for example, have chiefly been aligned, first, to individual soul saving and, next, to the development of the individual Christian life. We have scarcely contemplated affecting society in the mass. We have placed peculiar emphasis, first, upon the revival, which is a series of attempts to rescue the unit soul; second, upon the class meeting, which is, preeminently, a series of exercises to develop the personal Christian life. Nearly all our preaching and prayers resolve upon the individual center. And what is true of us is also substantially correct of all the Christian denominations. We have exercises and books *ad infinitum* for the development of the individual; it is only quite recently that we are beginning to think much

of the duty of the Church to the State and society, of Christian citizenship and the moral responsibility of the ballot. Admitted, of course, that there have formerly been some furtive glances toward political duties aside from the direct line of the Church's march. When the blast of war has blown in our ears this for a while has compelled recognition of our obligation to assist in preserving the State. On Thanksgiving Day, also, the minister has perhaps descanted on some social reform, or scored some glaring political delinquency. But even at such times, not to speak of ordinary occasions, whenever the Church has looked in that direction we have felt a sense of newness and strangeness in our attitude. We were not quite sure of ourselves nor of our action.

A paragraph from an address before the Epworth League Convention, last year, in Indianapolis so coincides with the line of our thought touching one great enemy of the Church that we quote it in this connection :

> The time has come when Christian forces should make a new alignment. The important and substantial industries of the nation are against the saloon. The labor unions and fraternities that seek the betterment of the workingmen are against the saloon. The time, therefore, has come when Christian voters should ally themselves with the leaders of labor and industry, with the workingmen and manufacturer, and crush forever the foe of commerce, the enemy of labor, the promoter of poverty, of heavy taxes, and the inspirer of crime such as is committed nowhere else on earth but where the saloon is a recognized institution before the law.
>
> Let there be a new alignment. Let the Church of God stand ready to form a league, offensive and defensive, with any and every power wielding the ballot or shaping the thoughts of men. Let her leaders be seen in workingmen's conventions, let them confer with the leaders of labor and the managers of industry, and thus array against the unrestrainable enemy of all the concentrated, irresistible power of all.*

One result of the old alignment is that we have had all sorts of sporadic, temporary societies springing up for reform purposes outside the Church, which with a right attitude on our part might as well have been kept inside. There is a mistake somewhere, when those who want to work in any special way for the glory of God or the good of men have to go outside

* Address of R. J. Cooke, D.D.

to do it. The Church has a commission from on high to be sufficient unto all such things. It should be an inclusive and not an exclusive organization. Whatsoever things are good should have a place in the Church. Nothing akin to the welfare of man is foreign to it. It was not intended of God to be a little society—a mere small side show in the world—but to ultimately embrace within itself all the social relations and functions of the perfectly organized New Jerusalem let down from heaven.

A further result is that whenever a moral question—as slavery, prohibition of the saloon, and the like—has happened to become involved in party politics preachers have felt themselves warned off that ground. Over vast fields of moral thought and action our former too narrow ideal of the Church's function has put up the warning, "No thoroughfare," and, shutting out the pulpit, the divinely ordained moral instructor of the people, has turned over large areas of popular life and action to the ministry of secularism and diabolism. The pulpit should speak more fully of the duty of Christians to society. We ought to discuss the responsibility the ballot confers and the limits of proper party allegiance. We should preach not merely the obligation of Christian men to God, but also to Cæsar; and when it happens, as in our republic, that our hearers are themselves Cæsar, constituting the voting power, making and executing laws, and determining social conditions, we should inculcate upon the careless and immoral in politics the duty of getting new hearts and of turning their feet into right paths. No devil's outcry of "political preaching" should frighten ministers from their function of being true nineteenth century prophets of the Most High God. Satan has managed, by that innuendo against the public preaching of social and civic duties, to largely scare the pulpit into the realm of supernatural and the abstract, with the result that he continues to possess in great part the kingdom of this world. He can always be expected to howl with rage, of course, when the Church invades what he assumes is his territory; but that minister is a poor exponent of the God of righteousness and the final dominion of the good who yields to this protest of the adversary.

In this connection we quote with approval the words of a thoughtful and vigorous writer in a recent book:

> I never can understand the bold and persistent statement that Jesus had nothing to do with politics . . . except on the ground that we are anxious to keep him out of politics. . . . It is only an apostate Christianity that asserts that the Christ has nothing to do with politics. . . . The reign of Christ will never be, unless it comes as a political . . . reign. The notion that it can come otherwise is the accursed fruit of that worst and blackest of all heresies—the heresy that religion is one thing and life another. The kingdoms of this world belong to Christ; and the Christianity that the preaching of Christ must be kept separate from politics . . . is simply the betrayer of Christ into the hands of his enemies. The price paid for this treason is the money of political . . . self-interest, as it ever has been and ever will be, until we have the revival that shall show forth Christ as the giver of political law.*

Some may say: "Save the individual souls and you will save society. Convert men, make their hearts right, and you will need no new alignment." This is much the same as declaring: "Make all the individual citizens of a country brave and patriotic, and there will be no need to instruct them in military drill to repel the invader of their land. You can depend upon their courage and love of country alone to supply the lack of discipline." The individual soldiers of the Christian host are brave enough now; but they need to have the foe clearly pointed out to them, and then they should be taught how to move together and plant their shots unitedly against the brothel and the saloon, against corrupt politics and civic immoralities. A converted heart does not confer omniscient knowledge nor infallible judgment. Men need constant help in applying general principles of conduct to their own life—the "thou art the man" sort of address. Of what practical value, for example, is it to exhort one's hearers to vote for temperance members of the legislature when it is a fact, as those who have tested the matter have discovered, that not half of them know who their representatives are, much less are acquainted with their temperance record? In municipal contests those who are engaged in the struggle for civic righteousness find no obstacle to good government so potent as the ignorance of the average Christian voter regarding the

* Professor G. D. Herron, *Between Cæsar and Jesus.*

nominee or the officeholder of his own party. The partisan newspapers conspire to keep the voter in the dark, to confuse his judgment with party cries, to beget a craze of blind party enthusiasm which shall overslaugh all else. Christian voters frequently need enlightenment from the Church. There is often no other way by which the true facts can be conveyed to them except by the religious press or pulpit.

That there are dangers to the ministers and Church editor connected with such preaching of politics we admit in advance —dangers of misinformation, of wrong spirit in the preacher, of foolish speech, of stirring up the evil passions of some of his auditors. But, if we expect to open our mouths only when there is no danger, we had better resign our ministry as dumb dogs that dare not bark. And, if the Church is never to make a movement of a political sort, for fear of mistakes, it will likely commit a tenfold larger mistake by sitting still. Its supineness will countenance some moral wrong for which it would at least have escaped the responsibility by a brave effort for the abatement of the evil. As Satan drills his army in the tactics of unrighteousness, we need to teach our people how to effectually overthrow his plans by a federated, intelligent attack upon the enemy. If the children of this world are wise in their generation, the children of light must be none the less sagacious.

As bearing upon this matter of a new alignment it is most important to observe that the proposition does not involve any abandonment or abatement of the soul-saving work of the Church. If it did, any thought of addition to the scope of the Church's activities ought to be definitely dropped at once and forever. To address ourselves to civic duties does not involve the omission of the prayer meeting, the class, the revival, or any slackening of energy in rescuing and developing individuals. On the contrary, attention to civic duties will make this work more successful by attracting and holding a large number of people not now interested. For the Church to take a more active part in social politics will enlist the co-operation of persons of the practical, utilitarian type of character. At present it secures the sympathy of the other-worldly and spiritually-minded almost alone. In his recent

book a prominent writer * has forcibly shown us the need of broadening the Church idea in this respect. The work of the Church will then appeal to men, and to the masculine virtues of forcefulness and courage in addition, as it does now to the feminine graces of tenderness and patience. One of the main reasons why women now so outnumber men in our membership is because the current type of religion is adapted almost exclusively to the passive, feminine virtues rather than to active, virile excellences. Give men something to do that suits the manly character, speak to them upon themes that interest men, and the numbers who care for the Church will be larger.†

The widening of the religious horizon, for which we contend, would afford a greater variety to the exercises of the Church and thus stimulate a larger interest. To the pulpit it would legitimize a vast number of the themes which are now largely rejected as very interesting but of somewhat doubtful propriety. Let a preacher, for example, speak of the enforcement of the laws of the city and of the proper conditions of success in business life, or of the causes of physical health, and there are thousands who declare that it is very entertaining and instructive but that "it is not the Gospel." The preacher, in their opinion, is a sensationalist, or a lecturer, rather than a true minister of Christ. An enlargement of the Church's ideal would show that his preaching has just as legitimate a bearing on the spread of Christ's kingdom as the preaching of the revivalist.

This enlargement of ideal would also remove the bane of deadness from many a prayer and conference meeting which now revolves too exclusively around personal religious experience. It is this narrowness of scope which accounts for the habitual absence of many of our most worthy people from these gatherings. Spiritual egotism and selfishness, no matter how refined, soon cease to be attractive. The bringing in of such a practical topic as how to help the poor of the city, or how to abate the saloon on the next corner, would insure variety, would inter-

* Professor George S. Coe, *The Spiritual Life.*

† It has been often remarked, for example, in Columbus, the residence of the writer, that Dr. Washington Gladden's pulpit, which dwells mainly upon applied Christianity, has attracted the men of the city more than any other.

est the people, and would surely be the first step in the doing of Christly work.

We would thus bring to the membership of the Church a broader development. The incessant focalization of thought and effort in personal self-culture would be swallowed up and lost in a larger, more operative love. The truest self-development comes not by incessantly watching and speaking of our moods and feelings, but by forgetting them and going out of self into the life of service for others. The reason some of the best men and women of the Church feel no interest in what are called the "social means of grace" is because they are anything but "social;" they are merely introspective, centripetal. They direct attention and thought to self; whereas Jesus taught that we would save our lives by losing sight of self and by cherishing the sentiment of good will toward others. Such an enlargement of the purposes of our religious assemblies would at least produce a better balancing of the introspective and the outgoing tendencies of human nature, of the centripetal and centrifugal forces, and would lead us to resolve in a more symmetrical orbit.

The new alignment for which we plead is perfectly practicable. The good citizenship movements in the Epworth League, the Society of Christian Endeavor, and the Baptist Young People's Union all look in this direction. The Church of the future is in these associations of Christian young people. "Look up," first says the Epworth League; then, next, "Lift up." Its members do not stand looking dreamily into heaven like the men of Galilee, but they go forth to preach and practice a social Gospel, as the disciples were bidden do, beginning at Jerusalem. In this they are a model for the Church.

Such an attempt to cleanse the springs of national life by going into questions of politics that are moral would involve the cooperation of all the denominations, and this also is practicable. The Churches are already learning to work together. The American Bible Society, the Evangelical Alliance, the Christian Commission in the civil war, the Young Men's Christian Association, the American Antisaloon League—all these are instances of united effort which could be increased tenfold by a universal crusade for civic righteousness. In an

irregular, furtive way many of the Churches now engage somewhat in politics after the fashion we advocate. They sometimes make common cause for the election of temperance officers, the enforcement of antisaloon laws, and the like. All we plead for is that the Church as a whole should do this regularly and boldly, as part of its well-defined and established policy, and not fitfully and half apologetically as now.

It is perfectly practicable, for example, that the churches of any considerable city before the next primaries should hold a pre-primary Christian convention and serve notice on all political managers that the moral character of every candidate would be carefully reviewed, and also that no candidate would be supported by the religious people who would not engage to enforce the laws against gambling, unlawful saloon-keeping, and brothels. If it were once understood that any candidate distasteful to the churches would receive their united opposition at the polls, political managers would be quite sparing of such nominations, and, taught by consequences, would scarcely affront the religious and moral citizens more than once. Such a pre-primary convention would certainly be quite as Christian as a church mass meeting to devise help for the persecuted Chinese Christians or to provide for sending the Gospel to Africa.

When notoriously evil nominations have once been made good men reckon it right to get together and defeat them. Why not forestall this necessity by the pre-primary Christian convention? Why not do with deliberate forethought and open declaration, in advance, what we afterward secretly try —often too late—to do anyhow? Why not declare that we are in the battle for righteousness, as Churches, and to stay? A New York brewer said: "The Church people can drive us when they try, and we know it. Our hope is in working after they grow tired, and continuing to work three hundred and sixty-five days in the year." We should be a standing army for the kingdom of God, always in the field. Both sides of a board cannot be on top at once; one must be under. Morality must be above, or it is beneath. The Churches will rule or be ruled. We are largely ruled by the elements of evil now; and the fault is ours because of our divisions and

our squeamishness about coming out clearly on the Lord's side. We sin; for, when God has given us the power to rule, we ought to do this.

This work involves the separation of local and municipal politics from national politics, in many cases. There is no need, for example, to mix the enforcement of the law for the Sunday closing of saloons with the tariff or the silver question. It is a trick of professional politicians, who make their living by the game, to run the two together, in order to keep Christian voters in line with saloon followers. Or if, in any case, they do legitimately coincide, we are not usually so poor in good men in any party but that political managers can present decent candidates to represent national ideas. For example, there is no need to nominate a tool of the liquor traffic to set forth free silver in the State legislature. Virtue is not so scarce in any party that in order to get its party views regarding tariff advocated in the national congress it must endure the candidacy of a moral leper. Let notices be served on caucuses that, in order to hold Christian voters in line upon national issues, they must nominate candidates who will subserve local morality also, and they will usually take the hint. If the Churches are duly insistent in the matter, Christian people will usually find the interests of local righteousness and their several party convictions on national questions represented together in upright candidates.

The programme we advocate will involve a certain sacrifice of party spirit by some Church members. It will call for a certain crucifixion of pride to vote against the nominee of one's party at the suggestion of the Church. But we already submit to its guidance in far more important particulars, and it is safe to assume that humble and teachable Christians will welcome information which will enable them to do their duty at the polls. If their grace is not up to this mark, they would have to obtain more or go from among us. For the Church must come to act in such things as a moral unit. We have allowed ill-informed, misdirected notions of personal liberty to shear the Church of political power. Politicians fear one saloon more than ten churches. We have subjected concert of action to individual whims until, instead of moving "like a mighty

army," as we sing, our congregations are more like a series of undisciplined mobs. We must learn to sacrifice our own questionable love of party to the greatest good of the greatest number. It is surely not extravagant to believe that devout Christians, as a whole, may come to do this in politics, as they are now doing in so many other directions, or as they even now do in politics when acquainted with the moral bearings of any nomination.

A recent statement is that "a letter signed by the bishops of London and Rochester, Rev. H. Price Hughes, Rev. F. B. Meyer, and the chief rabbi has been issued, calling upon the municipal electors in the New London boroughs to abstain from party politics and vote for candidates solely with a desire to promote the social and moral reform of the people." Such a movement would be an illustration of the general thought advocated by this article. Perhaps the Church of England is to lead the Church of America in the new alignment for the new ideal.

J. C. Jackson,

Art. II.—JONES VERY—A SON OF THE SPIRIT.

"I knew a man who under a certain religious frenzy, omitting all compliment and commonplace, spoke to the conscience of every person he encountered, and that with great insight and beauty. At first he was resisted, and all men agreed he was mad. But persisting, as, indeed, he could not help doing for some time in this course, he attained to the advantage of bringing every man of his acquaintance into true relations with him. No man would think of speaking falsely with him, or of putting him off with any chat of markets or reading rooms. But every man was constrained by so much sincerity to face him, and what love of nature, what poetry, what symbol of truth he had, he did certainly show him."—*Emerson's appreciation of J. Very, in his essay on "Friendship."*

On Main Street in the village of Peabody, Massachusetts, at its junction with Boston Street, Salem, is a little graveyard consecrated by the dust of the Reverend Jones Very, who, dying on a May day, 1880, was buried there. A granite family monument at the foot of a locust tree, surrounded by an iron railing, marks the place, and a marble slab, flat in the leveled earth, distinguishes the poet's grave. The writer pilgrimed thither on a July afternoon, 1900, walking out from the glutted center of Salem through old Federal Street and stopping by the way at No. 154, where the poet lived for many years, and died. The directory at Peabody Museum makes no note of the place, and a stranger would not know that the poet of transcendentalism, the friend and fellow of Ralph Waldo Emerson, one of America's noblest sonnet writers, once lived in the ancient town where Roger Williams preached, Giles Corey suffered martyrdom, and Nathaniel Hawthorne wrote *The Scarlet Letter*. True, the poet whom Emerson, Hawthorne, and Bryant knew is not the poet of the crowd; and he sometimes wrote verse which no criticism, however sympathetic, can pronounce poetic. Not always was he inspired. He wrote, as Wordsworth often wrote, by habit or by volition; and it is no dishonor to say of him, as it has been said of Wordsworth, that a selection of his poetry is essential to his place in literature.

He was, first of all, the poet of transcendentalism, that

unique intellectual movement of the early nineteenth century, which, subordinating the Hebrew-Christian sacred books to the monitions of the spirit, sought truth by new attitudes of independent or self-dependent insight and inquiry. An old Concord villager, whom the writer found mowing grass in the yard that surrounds the abandoned Hillside Chapel, where the School of Philosophy used to meet, remarked that the Concord philosophers endeavored to know more than God himself knows.

There is a quality of mysticism, therefore, in Very's verse which sets him forever apart and makes him the poet of those who seek the spirit in hidden places. He was characteristically a recluse spirit, an unpopular poet, speaking to the few, but to them with a voice of authority. Mary Fisher, in her *General Survey of American Literature*, says, "An overweening vanity and persuasion of his own purity made him lose all sense of relation and proportion." But that is a crudely false and distorted estimate, wholly out of tune with his genuine humility. No one can gaze long at the portrait which prefaces his collected works without seeing that Jones Very was the incarnation of the sublimated moral sense. He said that he felt it an honor to wash his own face because it was the temple of the Spirit. It was his virtue that, there in Salem, he achieved a refined and scrupulous purity which, while it partook of the mystical, dreamy piety of the cloister, was yet an out-of-door piety, genuine in unselfishness.

Miss Fisher, who exhibits especial detestation for the poet, says: "His love of God crowded from his heart the love of man. He was pure, but his purity was that of white, dry sand, in which not even a nettle will grow, and so, 'our brave saint,' as Emerson calls him, has done less for the world than many a sinner with the gift of song." Perhaps Very did not do much for "the world," but if, for many years, he lived a semirecluse life in the old house on Federal Street, his earlier career was potent in excessive moral activity and self-assertiveness. Emerson wrote: "Jones Very is gone into the multitude as solitary as Jesus. In dismissing him I seem to have discharged an arrow into the heart of society. Wherever that young enthusiast goes he will astonish and discon-

cert men by dividing for them the cloud that covers the gulf in man."

Emerson knew Very in the days of his enthusiasm, when he was talking religion to Harvard students, evangelizing the ministry of Salem, writing sonnets at the rate of two a day, and charging all his environing atmosphere with the electricity of his intense moral conviction. To Emerson, indeed, we owe the publication, in 1839, of a volume of Very's poems—the precious "first edition"—a copy of which, belonging to the late George Ticknor, may be seen in the Boston Public Library—this high function of the poet-philosopher being performed not only as a tribute to Very's genius, but as a recognition of the moral energy that had sought to attach him to his "school." But Emerson held true to the revelations that had been made to his own mind, and convinced Very that, though there was one spirit or mind, there were many voices of utterance and modes of manifestation. Very then went his own way, but for a period of two or three years lived the life of a moral enthusiast, an evangelist of the individual soul. At Harvard, in an institution where suspense of judgment on religious questions is regarded as characteristic of the highest culture, his tutor-ministry became unwelcome, and at Salem doubts as to his sanity arose. The movement to incarcerate him originated, it would appear, among certain ministers of religion whom he disturbed in their sleep. "He called on the different members of the profession and offered to pray with them, that they might submit themselves wholly to the divine will and be baptized with the Holy Ghost." And in this one is reminded of John Woolman, the Quaker of Mount Holly, New Jersey, who was moved by the Spirit to bear testimony against slavery, thereby disturbing the "Society" and exciting a spirit of offense. It is said that Very was generally received with courtesy, but "some of the brethren demanded that the peripatetic evangelist be shut up in an insane asylum." And the parish had peace. Of his "insanity," however, there must be reasonable doubt. However, it is good to read that, being persuaded that he needed treatment for nervous exhaustion consequent upon the highly wrought state in which he had lived, he consented to put himself under care of a physician at Somerville, Massa-

chusetts. Calmly emerging, 1843, he took up such work in the Unitarian ministry as was given him to do until, in 1880, his life ended. "He was never a popular preacher, and received no regular pastorate, but occasionally supplied a Unitarian pulpit. He never married, but, after the death of his mother, lived quietly in the family home with his sisters. His mornings were spent in study, and his afternoons in rambling alone over the fields and hills." He was never "popular," and did not do much for "the world;" but a minister for whom he sometimes preached said, "I told my people that to see Very for half an hour in my pulpit and know that such a man existed in the world was a far greater sermon than any ever preached to them from the lips of an orator."

The author of the *Survey*, from whom we have already quoted, says of his personal appearance :

> His portrait represents a long, thin face, the cheeks drawn in and covered on the lower part with a scant fringe of hair, the mouth pursed up, the eyes sunken and dreamy, the forehead bald, the top head high and pointed arched. It is the face of one to whom the world is but a place of unwilling sojourn, the face of one who would be solitary in crowded places, and in whose heart there is an unstilled hunger for the unknown.

In truth, there is not a line in all Very's poetry to prove that this world was to him a place of "unwilling sojourn," not a line to show that he had an "unstilled hunger for the unknown." He believed that nature is the garment of the immanent God and that his life lay in the plan of God; whether here or there, his life was one with the will of God. For him the supreme activity of the human volition lay in the endeavor to do always, as Jesus of Nazareth had done, the holy will of the divine Father. He believed that he had identified his personal will with that of the holy Fatherhood, and therefore rested patiently in the unfolding of his career. It has been alleged that transcendentalism lifted him, then left him, and that, after his exaltation and descent, he never came to his own. It is certain that he never became a "practical man;" political economists class him as a "consumer;" materialistic critics pronounce him infertile, a mere parasite.

Perhaps it was from some self-consciousness of his seem-

ing uselessness as a member of society that he wrote these sonnets:

THE IDLER.

I idle stand that I may find employ,
Such as my Master when he comes will give;
I cannot find in mine own work my joy,
But wait, although in waiting I must live.
My body shall not turn which way it will,
But stand till I the appointed road can find,
And journeying so his messages fulfill,
And do at every step the work designed.
Enough for me still day by day to wait
Till Thou who form'st me find'st me too a task,
A cripple lying at the rich man's gate,
Content for the few crumbs I get to ask;
A laborer but in heart, while bound my hands
Hang idly down, still waiting thy commands.

THE HAND AND FOOT.

The hand and foot that stir not, they shall find,
Sooner than all, the rightful place to go,
Now in their motion free as roving wind,
Though first no snail so limited and slow;
I mark them full of labor all the day,
Each active motion made in perfect rest.
They cannot from their path mistaken stray,
Though 'tis not theirs yet in it they are blest;
The bird has not their hidden track found out,
The cunning fox though full of art he be.
It is the way unseen, the certain route,
Where, ever bound, yet thou art ever free.
The path of Him whose perfect law of love
Bids spheres and atoms in just order move.

This is the expression of a profound philosophy of life. The Salem poet, so sensitively dowered, so scholarly in habitude of mind; a lover of books and a lover of nature; withal, too, a genuine lover of man; a "strange recluse," to quote his sister's phrase, who was never more abroad than when in his study and never more shut in than when rambling over the hills that skirt Salem—he held a philosophy which even in the Stock Exchange is recognized to be sane and admirable. The *Boston Herald* of July 27, 1900, contains this paragraph in the "financial" columns:

So welcome is the rain that traders in the market are content to do nothing but wait, content in idleness, and the quality of idleness to-day,

as comparable with the rainfall, is of pronounced description, and should prove a good thing for individuals and the market. This idleness attests the futility of the late attempt to boom the market, with so many important factors missing. Idleness gives opportunity to study the situation and weigh the factors for and against the success of speculative endeavor.

Very had no knowledge of markets and not much knowledge of men, as men count "knowledge," but he knew the significance of patient submission to inevitable conditions. He was thrust aside from the strong currents of native life, his career was doomed to the narrow circles of an eddy—but he bore in noble, uncomplaining silence the burden of a seeming failure. Emerson predicted for him a large and growing audience, but Very's audience was never large, and for a decade it has not grown. In the great public libraries there is no demand for his "work," and critics cannot agree as to his place in the world of American literature.

"Never was there more foolish overrating of a humble power of rhyming" is the opinion of Miss Fisher in one of her recent surveys of the world of American letters. "His love for nature," she adds, "never rises above a comfortable sensation of being undisturbed in his self-communings." But in "The Columbine" is found a sentiment deeper than that of "drowsy comfort;" in it there is expressed in almost perfect form that sense of identification with inner nature which the true poet always has, and which every matured soul has in its higher moods of insight:

> Still, still my eyes will gaze long fixed on thee,
> Till I forget that I am called a man;
> And at thy side fast-rooted seem to be,
> And the breeze comes my cheek with thine to fan.
> Upon this craggy hill my life shall pass,
> A life of summer days and summer joys,
> Nodding our honey-bells 'mid pliant grass,
> In which the bee half hid his time employs;
> And here we'll drink with thirsty pores the rain,
> And turn dew-sprinkled to the rising sun,
> And look when in the flaming west again
> His orb across the heavens its path has run.
> Here left in darkness on the rocky steep,
> My weary eyes shall close, like folding flowers, in sleep.

To understand verse so clear is not very difficult, but it is impossible for an unsympathetic compiler and bookmonger,

the mere critic of the schoolroom, to discern the cosmic quality of a sonnet that ranks among the finest ever written by an American. Indeed, Higginson and Bigelow in their collocation of *American Sonnets* quote as many from Jones Very as from either Aldrich, Lanier, Longfellow, Lowell, Louise C. Moulton, or Edith M. Thomas, giving him the fullest possible measure of recognition in the following noble group of sonnets:

LOVE.

I asked of Time to tell me where was Love.
He pointed to her footsteps on the snow,
Where first the angel lighted from above,
And bade me note the way and onward go,
Through populous streets of cities spreading wide,
By lonely cottage rising on the moor
Where bursts from sundered cliff the struggling tide,
To where it hails the sea with answering roar.
She led me on; o'er mountain's frozen head,
Where mile on mile still stretches on the plain,
Then homeward whither first my feet she led
I traced her path along the snow again;
But there the sun had melted from the earth
The prints where first she trod, a child of mortal birth.

NATURE.

The bubbling brook doth leap when I come by,
Because my feet find measure with its call;
The birds know when the friend they love is nigh,
For I am known to them both great and small;
The flowers that on the lovely hillside grow
Expect me there when Spring their bloom has given;
And many a tree and bush my wanderings know,
And e'en the clouds and silent stars of heaven,
For he who with his Maker walks aright
Shall be their lord, as Adam was before;
His ear shall catch each sound with new delight,
Each object wear the dress which then it wore,
And he, as when erect in soul he stood,
Hears from his Father's lips that all is good.

HE WAS ACQUAINTED WITH GRIEF.

I cannot tell the sorrows that I feel,
By the night's darkness, by the prison's gloom;
There is no sight that can the death reveal
The spirit suffers in a living tomb.
There is no sound of grief that mourners raise,
No moaning of the wind, or dirgelike sea,

Nor hymns, though prophet tones inspire the lays,
That can the spirit's grief awake in thee.
Thou, too, must suffer, as it suffers here,
The death in Christ, to know the Father's love;
Then in the strains that angels love to hear
Thou, too, shalt hear the spirit's song above,
And learn in grief what these can never tell
A note too deep for earthly voice to swell.

Dana and Bryant agreed that Very's sonnets possess extraordinary grace and originality, being "among the finest in the language." The collection made by W. P. Andrews, of Salem, published in 1883, justifies us in thinking with Simonds that in greatness, as well as in completeness of sincerity, the poems of Very may be taken as those of "one of the chief American poets." The sonnets are consummately perfect in form and possessed of that subtle power which Ruskin pronounced the paradox of art—"the power to stay what is fleeting, to enlighten what is incomprehensible, to incorporate the things that have no measure, and immortalize the things that have no duration." The history of their production is striking. "In the earlier period of his most remarkable production, during the years 1837–8–9, these verses poured forth from him with extraordinary rapidity and were penciled down as they 'came' to him, on a great sheet of paper which he had folded to pages of small note size." According to Miss Peabody "they were produced at the rate of one or two a day. When the sheet was full Mr. Very brought it to her and she transmitted it to Mr. Emerson at Concord, who afterward printed these verses with others, which Very himself gave him, substantially unaltered." To Very himself there was a kind of mystery about his writing; he regarded himself simply as a medium. Whatever may be the correct psychology of his poetic activity, literary criticism, if it be true to its own canons, must admit that the sonnets, at least, exhibit more than a "humble power of rhyming." If Jones Very—the Very of 1839—was only "a humble rhymer," then Curtis, Emerson, Hawthorne, Dana, and Bryant were mistaken in their panegyric. His was more than a "slender rill;" at his best he was one of our truest, greatest poets to whom nature opened her secrets.

The physical garment and external incident of Very's life were more than commonplace. A graduate of Harvard, holding honors equal with those conferred upon the head of his class who had taken the regular course in the university, he tutored there as a student in the Divinity School with such definiteness of impression that in 1880—the year of his death—the members of his classes gave tribute to his fine skill as an instructor in Greek and as a monitor in morals. For, even as a tutor in Greek, Very, a young man of twenty-three years, exercised high spiritual functions, visiting students in their rooms, addressing them on religious subjects, and urging them to give due attention to God. His method was more direct than that afterward employed by Phillips Brooks and the university preachers, but it was none the less sincere. Had he been a Catholic of the Middle Ages he would have been a monk and would have been duly sainted and honored with a "day" in the calendar; and even in these unmiraculous days a halo seems to shine about his white face, with its sunken cheeks, its high brow, its large eyes.

"His life must have been somewhat monotonous and dreary," says Andrews in the memoir. But there is no lament of loneliness in his verse; he rather seems to have accepted the fact of his isolation as a divine allotment, due to temperament and inwrought habit of mind. "He moved in Salem, like Dante among the Florentines, a man who had seen God and drew his inspiration from the spirit itself, far away in the soul, where no ambition comes, but only lowliness, humility, and seeking." He lived through the storm and stress period of the nation's life, but his opinions on the slavery question were not expressed. He took no part in the awful fight. Forty-eight years old when the war of 1861 began, he was in his sixty-seventh year when the problem of reconstruction had been solved.

When he died the *Salem Gazette*, in its issue of May 11, 1880—the first issue after his decease on Saturday, the 8th—contains an editorial headed, "Rev. Jones Very." It is a tribute to his purity, humility, unworldliness, his freedom from bigotry, his genuine interest in the great affairs of human history, his love of science, not for science' sake, but be-

cause it disclosed to him the laws of nature's God. For many years he had contributed to the columns of the *Gazette;* his last contribution, a sonnet on "The Influence of Channing," appeared in the issue of April 8, signed "J. V." With persistent love of letters, he was a frequent visitor at the *Gazette* office, soliciting use of such exchanges as contained articles on scientific subjects. One imagines the tall figure, clad after the fashion of another generation, with a suggestion of limitation in circumstance, evidently an unpractical man for whom there was no "position" anywhere in Church or State. Like John Foster, the essayist, he was not a preacher whom congregations like to hear, though at Eastport and Beverley he preached with more favor than at other places.

He was neither rich nor famous. He had done nothing, but the newspaper gave honor to his character. He had done nothing, but he was everything that a true man ought to be. He had won his soul, he had saved his life; he had made a guileless manhood, if he had not made money. He had been true to his "call." Emerson had said to him, "Do not let a whisper or a sigh of the muse go unattended to or unrecorded. The sentiment which inspires your poetry is so deep and true and the expression is so simple that I am sure you will find your audience very large." But the "audience" never appeared to fulfill the prophecy, and Very lived for many years face to face with his failure to get the wider hearing and the larger fame. Readers of the *Gazette* saw the initials "J. V.," but read the "news" and the "locals," and the poetry was not often copied. It is pathetic to read that, though conscious of his inability to win success either as writer or preacher, he preserved serenity of soul, sweetness of spirit.

It has been said that his philosophy was Buddhistic, at least in part; but he would have denied that. He accepted the Christ teaching, and affirmed that he had reproduced in himself Jesus Christ's attitude toward the Father. He could not disconnect his thought from the Hebrew-Christian books. He was a Channing Unitarian, whose moral earnestness had made him undesired in the pastorate. He was too orthodox for the liberals, too liberal for the orthodox. His catholicity made it impossible to catalogue him. Yet, passive and infer-

tile, his life had its place in the cosmos of God, and we may hope that to the writer of "The Created" will come the vision of peace:

There is naught for thee by thy haste to gain;
'Tis not the swift with Me that win the race;
Through long endurance of delaying pain
Thine opened eye shall see thy Father's face;
Nor here nor there, where now thy feet would turn,
Thou wilt find Him who ever seeks for thee;
But let obedience quench desires that burn,
And where thou art thy Father too will be.
Behold, as day by day the spirit grows,
Thou seest by inward light things hid before,
Till what God is, thyself, his image, shows,
And thou wilt wear the robe that first thou wore,
When, bright with radiance from his forming hand,
He saw the lord of all his creations stand.

This was the dream of the soul that we know as "Jones Very"—a soul whose life was hid with Christ in God; a poet whose verse is the voice of a pure spirit, dedicated to Him who is all and in all.

[NOTE.—The manuscripts of Jones Very's sermons and poems are deposited in the Harvard Divinity School Library. The sermons have never been published; the poems have been collected in a volume edited by Mr. Very's sisters, one of whom—the last of the Very family—lives in the old house on Federal Street in Salem, Mass. In a letter of August 24, 1900, she writes: "My sister and I published a complete edition of our brother's writings, although by some mischance the hymn, 'Wilt thou not visit me?' was omitted. This hymn is used in the churches of almost all denominations. One of my friends lately visiting Europe attended church in London, and the first hymn sung was 'Wilt thou not visit me?' The occupant of the pew told her it was a great favorite there. Dean Stanley says that he [Very] was the best hymn writer in America, and, when he came here said that the person whom he most wished to see was Jones Very; but they never met." The edition to which Miss Very refers is, for many reasons, preferable to the collection published by W. P. Andrews, although Mr. Andrews's biographical sketch has high value and puts his edition in supplemental relation to the complete works. Here and there I find readers of Very—the lovers of a verse which appeals to the innermost spirit. I am aware that his work is not popular, but it produces enthusiasm among those who hold the mystic sense of things, seeing Nature as a part of the Cosmos in which God is immanent as life, force, law, beauty, goodness.]

G. M. Hammell.

Art. III.—SOME QUESTIONS THAT EVOLUTION DOES NOT ANSWER.

When Laplace was accused by Napoleon of having written a book upon the system of the universe without even mentioning the Creator, he replied that he found no need for such a hypothesis. Without doubt, here lies the basis of the opposition which has been so widely raised against the doctrine of evolution. It has been felt that modern evolution is only an expansion of the theories of Laplace, and, if Laplace's system left no room for a Creator, still less should modern evolution need such a hypothesis. Using this term, then, to apply to the general theory of the development of the solar system from the primitive nebulous condition, the essence of the doctrine of evolution is that it explains the history of nature by action of natural forces and insists that all nature can be included in purely mechanical formulæ. A thoroughgoing evolutionist believes that all of the phenomena of nature are the results of purely mechanical forces and could have been mathematically calculated, even from the beginning, by an intelligence that understood the simple laws of nature. Inconceivably complex, to be sure, would have been the calculations. But the doctrine assumes that to a mathematician who understood the original nebula it would be equally possible to calculate by rigid law the formation of the world, the exact depth of the Atlantic Ocean at any point, the birth of Washington on February 22, 1732, or the revolt in the Philippines on February 4, 1899. With such a conception we can understand how one might say that, since the universe is complete in itself, there is no need for the hypothesis of a Creator. With such a conception it is easy to see that every step subsequently taken toward the verification of the great law of evolution has been indistinctly felt as making it less and less necessary to find a need for Deity in the universe. Advance in evolution has been, therefore, strenuously opposed at every point, from a feeling that only thus can a belief in God be retained. But, in spite of all opposition, the doctrine of evolution has steadily progressed toward acceptance, until to-day it makes the claim

that it is no longer a theory but a definite part of human knowledge; and certainly it is accepted by thinkers the world over, with practical unanimity.

It is not common for the student of evolution to put before himself, clearly and frankly, the question of how far his scientific explanation of the existing order of things is a complete explanation. To him, as he looks at nature, the infinite number of details is sufficient to claim his entire attention. These occupy his mind so constantly that he rarely looks above them. The sufficiency of the evolution doctrine to meet and explain these details becomes more and more apparent to his mind. As he thus studies nature, naturally enough the doctrine assumes a greater and greater prominence until it almost becomes a sufficiency in itself. He grows so confident in the ability of the evolution doctrine to account for the origin of species that he forgets to ask for the origin of life. So completely does he become filled with the notion of explaining nature by natural law that he forgets to ask what is natural law. His mind becomes chiefly a machine for explaining details in terms of assumed natural forces. Occasionally, perhaps, it is forced upon him that his methods of studying the correlation of force and the origin of species leave some great problems entirely outside the boundary of his thought. But this disturbs him only slightly, for he readily dismisses such topics, thinking them not worthy the time of a man who has tangible facts to investigate. These problems are insoluble and their study fruitless. Better, he thinks, devote his time to problems that can be solved. But, unfortunately, out of sight is frequently out of mind; and the evolutionist is in danger of forgetting the existence of these fundamental problems, in his eagerness to grasp the tangible within his reach. It is not unwise, therefore, to review occasionally, some of the broader aspects of nature, if for no other purpose than to discover, even when we accept the most extreme doctrine of evolution, how far we are from having a complete explanation of nature.

Admitting, then, that the evolutionist's conception of the origin of the world is correct, we must ask whether we have finally reached a position where there is no longer a need of

Deity in the universe. Is the mechanical conception of nature sufficient to render the universe intelligible without Deity? When our thoroughgoing evolutionist asks himself this question, which he rarely does, he is always forced, perhaps against his will, to answer in the negative. There was as much need of a Creator in Laplace's system as in the Mosaic conception of creation; and there is an equal need of such a hypothesis in the more thorough, complete theory of to-day. It is a need which the scientist sometimes relegates to the unknowable, sometimes conceals under the terms "force" and "power," but more commonly ignores completely as outside the pale of science and therefore nothing that he need concern himself about—regarding it as trivial to spend his time speculating over problems hopelessly inextricable. But these problems occasionally force themselves upon the attention of even the thoroughgoing evolutionist. So that we propose to notice four of the questions for which the mechanical doctrine of nature not only has no answer, but which admittedly never can be answered by any development of the theory. They are problems that lie entirely outside the possible reach of mechanics. We sometimes speak of them as breaks in the chain of evolution; but it is more exact to say, at least in regard to some of them, that they lie outside the chain of evolution. They are not breaks in the chain, for they are not a part of it. They appear to be independent of the mechanical aspects of nature, and cannot be touched by the evolution formulæ.

At the outset we notice that the mechanical theory of the universe lacks a foundation to stand upon. Nature, as we know it, is filled with what we call "matter," and actuated by what we call "force." It does not concern us here to ask what we mean by these terms—whether they are wholly distinct from each other, or are only two aspects of the same reality. It is the manifest fact that nature contains something which is the basis of the evolution, and upon which the mechanical theory is founded. Now the great significance of the doctrine of evolution is that it teaches us to trace backward the history of this material universe. We trace the material of living bodies of animals and planets to the earth. We trace the earth back in history to a molten sphere. We trace

this sphere back to the central sun. We trace the sun back to a diffused nebula occupying space. In all this history we find the same material, the same energy. The very stone on which we stand and the force with which we lift our arm were in existence in the early ages. As we go back thus, we find nothing new, nor do we at any stage find a single atom of matter or a single moiety of energy in existence that was not in existence in the previous age. But when, in this history, we reach the nebula we stop. We stop, not because we are satisfied, for any mechanical theory must ask what came before the nebula. We have no more reached a resting place than had the ancients when they placed the world on the turtle's back. We stop, because we have no answer to such a question. Give us the nebula with its matter and force, and simply start it into motion; after that, with our evolution formula, we may explain nature. But from whence can we derive the nebula? This question no one has even tried to answer, for the uselessness of the attempt is recognized. No matter what previous condition of things might be assumed as producing the nebula, the question would only be carried back a step further, and the question of origin would be as prominent as ever. Indeed, we must recognize at once that the solving of the problem of origin is, to the finite mind, insoluble. "There is only one theory of origin in the field, and that is creation," says Drummond. Certainly the most mechanical theory of the universe that anyone was ever able to conceive never contained a theory of origin.

It is simply impossible to gain any comprehension of what we mean by creation. We cannot conceive of the universe coming from nothing. "*Ex nihilo nihil fit.*" Logically we are forced to assume the eternal existence of either the universe or its Creator. But the eternal existence of matter, even if granted, involves us in inextricable difficulty. Astronomy and physics tell us that this solar system of ours began with the nebula, not an infinite but a finite number of years ago. They tell us, too, that it is progressing toward a definite end of stagnation. Our system thus has a history of definite length. If it had started its existence an infinite number of æons ago, it would have run through this definite

206231

history long since. But because it is still continuing its activity the fact follows that it started into existence at some definite, finite period. To start into existence at a definite point in time is contradictory to the conception of the eternal existence of matter. Hence, if matter is eternal, we must assume that the nebula is not the beginning, but only a phase in an endless cycle, and that our system, instead of running down to a condition of stagnation, will in the end become dissipated again into a nebulous matter, to begin its history once more. A series of cycles from nebula to system and from system back to nebula again is the only thought not contradictory to the idea of an eternal universe. But the sciences upon which we base all our theories tell us not of endless cycles, but of an end in stagnation. Eternal matter thus only lands us in inextricable difficulties. If this system began at a definite time, what started it? If it is eternal, it should have passed to its end of stagnation long ago.

Nor are we entirely easy in our mind if we adopt the other suggestion of a finite creation and an infinite Creator. Even the theist's answer that God created the universe solves nothing. It only again hides the questions in the shadows of infinity, which simply means that our minds are entirely insufficient to grasp them. For the question then arises, What created God? If this question is absurd, the other aspect of the matter is hardly more satisfactory. The notion of a God of infinite time, existing an infinity of æons and contemplating his own grandeur, or thinking for an infinite period of the myriads of kinds of universes which he might create, is certainly a very unsatisfactory way of avoiding the difficulty. We are simply face to face with problems which the human mind cannot grasp. Neither infinity nor finite existence satisfies our logic. The very existence of the universe, finite or infinite, is a logical absurdity.

We thus see that a mechanical conception of the universe has no foundation upon which to rest. All questions as to origin simply land us in nothingness or in meaningless phrases. Grant existence to the nebula with its matter and force and the starting of motion at a definite period of time, and the present order may flow from it by the process which

we call evolution. But to grant the nebula is certainly granting the whole, and at all events it is clear that to-day no one can ponder these topics in the light of modern evolution and repeat with Laplace that he finds no need of a Deity. The evolution theory is very useful, but in using it alone we are like the mechanic who might think he has made a watch with a screw-driver because with this tool he had been able to put together in a running condition the parts of a watch furnished him by the master-workman.

But, leaving fundamental questions of origin which are admittedly insoluble for any theory, we notice that there are other defects in the complete mechanical explanation of the universe. Given the nebula with its resident forces and we may proceed smoothly enough in the formation of worlds and in the fashioning of the earth with its mountains, valleys, oceans, and rivers. But presently, with the appearance of living things, we must start a new order of phenomena. After all that may be said by the materialist upon the problem of life, we must certainly admit that we have something new. For our purpose we need point out only one phase of the life process. All other processes in nature with which we are familiar result in the degradation of physical energy and in the destruction of complex chemical compounds. Throughout the physical universe there is everywhere a tendency in chemical elements to assume more and more stable conditions, which means the production of simpler compounds with the elimination of heat. In living nature alone we find a building up of compounds and a storing of energy. A physical process breaks up the compounds in gunpowder, liberating the energy and reducing the elements to simpler and more stable parts. It requires the agency of what we call "life" to build up these compounds. The power of building up belongs alone to life. Living nature has, further, the unique power of indefinite multiplications by division, and each of the parts arising thus has this same power of constructing still other parts; while nothing in nature, so far as we know, has from any other source a similar power. The rest of nature is ever pulling to pieces; life alone is building up.

Now, in the mechanical doctrine of nature, we have found

at the origin of life an obstacle which is up to the present time insurmountable. In all the magnificent attempts to build up nature by mechanical laws the chapter on the origin of life has been left unwritten. How to introduce these new features into the scheme we cannot say. In this universal tendency toward degradation of matter how can we account for a new phase which builds it up? The origin of life is certainly still unsolved. Not only is this so, but we are, apparently going farther away from a solution of it, rather than advancing toward it, with our increased study. The biologist, from the beginning of his conceptions of evolution, has been confident that he could ultimately solve this problem. He has insisted, and he still insists, that it is radically different from the question of creation. The latter, he admits, is unthinkable; but the origin of life appears to him soluble. Indeed, a few years ago, he felt that he was on the high road to that solution. With the discovery that all living phenomena are manifested by the one substance, protoplasm, and that protoplasm is capable of chemical analysis, disclosing itself to be related to albumen, it seemed as if he had approached close to his goal. It was only necessary, then, to assume that under the different conditions of early eras the chemical elements were united in different methods from those of to-day. This is probable enough. We well know that chemical union is largely dependent upon conditions. If temperatures and electrical conditions differ, the same elements will unite in different ways and produce different compounds. In the early history of the earth certainly these conditions were widely different from those of the present time. Remembering these facts it is only necessary to assume that among the various compounds which appeared in the earth's early history were some that approached the structure of protoplasm, and we have, in theory at least, a notion of a natural origin of life. Influenced by such ideas the biologist was insisting that the problem of the origin of life was not only soluble, but that the solution was just at hand.

But even a biologist must admit that we are certainly more distant to-day from this solution than we seemed to be a few years ago. This protoplasm, which was so promising and upon

which so much hope was based, has proved, in a measure, a delusion. To-day we do not know what we mean by protoplasm; no such thing as pure protoplasm can be found. We know only living animals and plants. We have no knowledge of the simplest life substance. A physical basis of life in the earlier sense is no longer thought of. Life, even in its simplest condition, is not manifested in any chemical compound or mixture of compounds. We are forced to-day to conclude that what we call "life" is the function of that minute but intricate machine which the biologists have called the cell. The intricacy of this machine and its fine adjustment of parts have been made out only in the most recent years. But the recognition of this machine and the necessity of the dependence of the life phenomena upon it have forced our biologists to abandon the hopes of making living matter. Life is manifested only in the cell machine, and to explain its origin we must discover forces capable of constructing machines. Blind forces may make worlds, and through the agency of chemistry may produce chemical compounds ever so complex. But in our experience, certainly, blind forces do not make machines. The problem of the origin of life has thus ceased to be the chemical one we thought it to be twenty-five years ago. It has become at least mechanical, involving the discovery of forces capable of adapting part to part. If we can find forces in nature capable of building a machine with part adapted to part, to act for distinct ends, and if it can be shown that these forces could have acted upon the materials of the primeval world in such a way as to construct a machine like the living cell, then we may find the solution of the origin of life.

These forces may yet be found; the biologist thinks they will be. His law of natural selection has already shown him that nature does have forces adapted to machine-building, although those now known cannot apply to the building of the cell machine. It is still the belief of many that forces explaining the origin of life will be discovered. Many a contribution to this subject is being made. We are treated to new theories of the asymmetrical molecule of living compounds, in distinction from the symmetrical molecules of nonliving matter. We are told that the chemical solution of the life problem is close at

hand because, forsooth, one has been able to stimulate an egg into development by the use of chemical compounds in place of the normal method of fertilization. But, after all, these do not bring us any nearer to the solution of the problem, and the origin of life remains the same *ignis fatuus* that it has been from the first. Its solution by natural means seems certainly much less hopeful to-day, since the microscope studies of the last quarter of a century have revealed the wonders of protoplasm, than it did forty years ago when the subject was first brought to the attention of science. But there appears here no inherent possibility in the way of solution. Though there is a veritable break in the chain, it may, perhaps, some day be bridged. It is not like the problem of creation, unthinkable.

The next question which arises is more than a break in the chain. In the origin of conscious sensations we have a problem that lies outside the mechanical aspect of nature. We must say conscious sensations, because it is this factor—the perceptions of the sensations—that makes the problem insoluble. In simple sensitiveness there need not be any very difficult problem. Sensitiveness may mean the simple property of reacting when stimulated. But, in this sense, we may say that gunpowder is sensitive to heat, for it certainly reacts under such a stimulus. Considering the sensations of animals, we are met with just this difficulty of not knowing what we mean by sensations. It is true that all animals give evidence of sensations. Even the lowest animal will react when stimulated, and from this point upward we find it a universal rule among animals that reaction follows stimulation. Now the only knowledge we have that animals or individuals have sensations is the fact that they react when stimulated. If we step on a dog's tail, the action of the dog tells us that he has sensations. If a distinct motion of any kind follows a touch, or if animals move toward the light, we say they have sensations accompanying these external phenomena. But, however useful this rule may be, it is not sufficient to indicate conscious sensations. We must remember that a man reacts to a stimulus, even though sound asleep, with no consciousness whatever. So in animals it may be that the structure of the animal machine is such that certain external forces start it into

activity, just as a touch on the throttle valve will start an engine into motion. With such a conception sensations need not mean any break in the mechanical series. But the moment we introduce consciousness into the problem the whole question assumes a new aspect. Although gunpowder reacts to stimulus, no one ever thinks of it as conscious of the matter. The steam engine is certainly sensitive, but it has no conscious sensations. In this idea of a sensation and the accompanying consciousness there is certainly a new factor. But, further, it is impossible to conceive such sensations as belonging to the mechanical series. Consciousness with its sensations is neither matter nor force. It belongs to an entirely different category. When heat in an engine is converted into motion the heat disappears. But the motion takes its place, and the heat reappears when the motion ceases. So far as we know no heat disappears when sensations arise, for sensation does not lie in the mechanical series at all. Energy and consciousness are entirely unlike, and no one, however complete a materialist he may be, has ever succeeded in drawing the faintest parallel between them. The break in the continuity is absolute.

Now we cannot say where, in the animal kingdom, this factor of conscious sensation appeared. Whether it is coextensive with life, or is present only in the higher members of the animal kingdom, whether it occurs among plants, or only in animals, we cannot say. By the most careful study of the actions of living things our biologists have been able to say that, all things considered, the evidence is against supposing it to exist in plants and the lowest animals, but that it appears in the higher animals somewhere, although it is impossible to say exactly where. But it is pointed out, at the same time, that this is exactly parallel to its appearance in the individual man. In the beginning of man's existence as an *ovum* he certainly has no sensations, and it is just as impossible to say where, in the course of his development, he first becomes possessed of conscious sensations as it is to say where this factor appeared among animals. But it certainly has appeared in man, developing side by side with the growth of his brain. The clear parallelism between the growth of brain and the development of conscious sensations has led to various philosophical

attempts to correlate them, giving on the one side a dualism and on the other a monism, either material or spiritual. But, in spite of all theories, the distinctness of these two phases of nature remains as bold as ever. The origin of the first conscious sensation is a problem not only unsolved, but, we can hardly fail to admit, insoluble. It is a lack in the evolutionary theory more serious than that at the beginning of life. Certainly the origin of life may be a mechanical problem of infinite complexity, but the origin of consciousness is a problem outside of the mechanical factors of nature, and therefore cannot be included in the evolutionary formula.

One more problem lying outside of the mechanical aspect of nature must be mentioned. This is the problem of volition or free will. It is not our purpose to enter into a discussion of this vexing problem. It has been discussed until it is threadbare, but it is no clearer to our understanding to-day than it was the first time it was brought up for thought. It certainly does not lie on the mechanical side of nature. It is neither matter nor energy. Energy is measurable, but no one ever thought of the possibility of measuring volition. All attempts to study volition from the mechanical side of nature result only in denying its existence. In a theory that reduces nature to a mechanism, as the theory of evolution tries to do, there is absolutely no possibility for the existence of volition. Each moment in the history of the universe is accounted for by the conditions of the moment before. An intelligence which could grasp all the facts of to-day could predict, according to the evolutionary formula, all the incidents of to-morrow. But manifestly this is an impossibility, if volition enters into the factor. Some have thought it possible to reconcile foreknowledge and free will, but no one ever conceived it possible to reconcile free will with a theory of necessity in nature. If man is at liberty to choose between the two courses, then the incidents of to-morrow cannot be calculated from the conditions of to-day, for volition may change the result. If the incidents of the morrow flow mathematically from the conditions of to-day, then volition does not count. The existence of volition runs absolutely counter to any mathematical predictions for the future. The student of mechanism must ask, "How can

volition have any influence?" To one thoroughly filled with a belief in the absoluteness of the conservation of energy it is impossible to conceive the mechanical outcome of a set of conditions influenced by a factor which is not energy and which lies entirely outside of the equation. To the mechanical view of nature the present is the sign of equality, connecting the past and the future, and the two sides of the equation must balance. Introduce volition and the equality is upset. Volition is, in short, an impossibility to the thoroughgoing evolutionist who feels that his mechanical formulæ are sufficient to account for nature and who can see nothing outside of the material universe. Hence, we find a general denial of the existence of volition. Not only animals, but mankind as well, are said to be automata, and the belief that they have any volition is wholly fallacious. All their actions are necessitated. It makes no difference whether one commits a murder or saves a life; the act is forced upon him by conditions, and is wholly lacking in merit. Each is simply the result of mechanical conditions and absolutely inevitable. We are no more to blame for committing a crime than gunpowder is for blowing up a ship, and no more to be praised for doing a good action than is gunpowder for blowing up an obstruction to navigation. Whatever may be said of this conclusion, it is clear enough that it proves beyond doubt that volition is not and cannot be included within the compass of the complete evolution doctrine which reduces the material universe to a purely mechanical formula.

Now, it will never be possible to convince mankind that his volition counts for absolutely nothing in the course of his life. We may argue it as we will; our belief in the reality of our volition will remain as firm as ever. It is doubtful whether even the scientist who argues that animals are automata really believes that his volition counts for nothing. Our only knowledge of nature comes from our consciousness and our mental activity, and the one fact that we are most supremely conscious of is our ability to choose between two courses. It is peculiar logic to insist that this fundamental matter of consciousness is wholly a mistake, and to base the reason for such insistence upon the fact that we cannot make this volition agree

with a mechanical interpretation of nature, when that mechanical interpretation has been built up by this same consciousness and mental activity. It is true that we cannot explain it or conceive of its possibility, but, as we have seen, it is an equal impossibility to conceive of creation. Logically, the existence of the universe with its laws and forces is inconceivable and, indeed, an absurdity. The existence of the universe does not fall within our mechanical formula. Logically, we cannot believe in our own existence. To deny the existence of volition, because we cannot include it in the formula of mechanical evolution, is just about as consistent as to deny our own existence because logically we cannot explain it. But we cannot deny our own existence, even if we will; and our own volition is as much a matter of direct consciousness as is our own existence. It is safe to say that a theory which finds no place for volition will never become a part of a belief of the world, in spite of the evident fact that we cannot include it in a mechanical formula of nature.

The outcome of all this is clearly that we have here another phase of nature which does not lie within the reach of the evolutionary formula. Admittedly, free will cannot be included in evolution. To evolution everything is a necessity, and the result of trying to include free will in the formula of evolution is to deny it absolutely. Even if we go to this extreme, we must then account for the universal belief that we do have that power of choice and that our volition does count in nature. This belief is as difficult to account for as free will itself. In short, the problem arising here is not only unsolved, but insoluble. The evolutionary formula is incomplete at the top, as well as at the foundation.

It must not be for a moment inferred that these inadequacies of evolution detract in the slightest degree from the universal importance and significance of the great doctrine. No theory, or rather, let us say, no discovery, made by man has ever had an illuminating power comparable to that shed upon nature by the doctrine known as evolution. Ever since the conception was first entertained its significance and its cogency have become daily more apparent, and as a method of the formation of worlds it has, each year, shed more light on the

dark places of nature. Against the most severe opposition it has demonstrated its right to persist, and it is to remain as a part of our knowledge of nature. But it is only a method of development, not a theory of origin. It demands as a basis a universe filled with matter and force, and it demands that in this nebulous mass motion should be started. Given this starting point and evolution shows us how the interaction of nature's forces has slowly produced the changes which have constituted the history of the solar system. Evolution unfolds the mechanical side of nature marvelously well. It throws an illuminating light upon the whole process of world-building. It explains wonderfully the existence of the marvelous adaptations in nature. It accounts readily for the development of organs among animals and plants adapted for distinct purposes. It easily accounts for the gradual elevation of the animal and vegetable kingdom, for the increasing complexity, the multiplying diversity, and the ever developing marvels of nature. For the mechanical world which we can see by opening our eyes it has everywhere its apt illustration. It has wonderfully illuminated nature wherever it has touched it. But evolution is a mechanical law, and deals only with matter and force. It demands their existence, in the first place, without so much as a thought as to where they came from or what they mean. It gives no explanation of these very forces which it so coolly appropriates to itself, nor of the matter which it supposes has undergone such marvelous transformations. It stumbles woefully at that new line of phenomena which we call "life," and it absolutely refuses to take into the slightest consideration the phenomena which we call "spiritual," including consciousness and volition, phenomena which stand forth even more prominently than the matter and forces with which evolution deals. It is a magnificent conception, giving all a more exalted idea of nature, and giving to the theist a more reverent idea of Deity.

But it is an incomplete doctrine, when we think of it as an attempt to include all nature within one formula. It has not justified the statement of Laplace that it leaves no need for the hypothesis of a Creator. We have placed our world upon the turtle's back, but furnished him no place to stand upon.

The real significance of nature lies deeper than the doctrine of evolution. We may, indeed evolutionists too frequently do, become so captivated with the study of the wonderful unfolding of nature under this law of evolution as to deceive ourselves into believing that we can thus picture the whole history. But this is only because we refuse to ask ourselves the more fundamental questions of the meaning of the very matter and forces which we are so deft in using in our explanations. Nature is absolutely incomprehensible. It is intelligible to us neither under the guise of the finite nor the infinite. In view of the great questions of the meaning of matter and force, the origin of nature, and the realities that underlie the phenomena, our formula for the evolution of the world appears lamentably weak and inadequate. It has indeed brought order out of chaos, but it has only forcibly confronted us with the great problems of the universe which limited minds are utterly unable to grasp. It has expanded our conception of infinity with the expansion of the universe and the extension of time back into the incalculable vistas of the past. It forces us to bow in more unutterable awe before that Something which lies behind the finite, which the scientist does not fail to recognize, though he may be unwilling to give it the name by which the Christian calls upon Infinity. Evolution has made atheism impossible. While it has, perhaps, modified our idea of what the nature of God is, the doctrine of evolution has demonstrated that nature as we know it is not its own explanation. The scientist calls himself an agnostic, and may not be a Christian; but he is no longer an atheist.

H. W. Conn

Art. IV.—WILBERFORCE—A STUDY OF FREEDOM.

Over Christendom at the opening of the nineteenth century hung the angry cloud of war, from which broke forth the flame and thunder of battle. Yet at that time began to dawn, though dim and misty as a Russian morning, the light of personal liberty. It was as when in the Apocalypse the beauty of the heavenly city beamed down from the sky over the agonies of Nero's gardens where martyrs were burning. Slavery had been prehistoric, its origin even back of tradition. Its early, if not primal, excuses had been that it made the weaker of our species industrious, orderly, and useful, while to the stronger it gave leisure for culture, government, and conquest. The philosophers and poets counted it, like deformity, illness, or poverty, a misfortune unmingled with any element of wrong. But early in the eighteenth century men's moral ideas began to stir with a vernal energy. Their feelings grew softer as with the breath of spring, and from their mellowing sympathies sprang, as from seed long dormant, many a shoot of the heavenly Father's planting. The impulse to justice and humanity marched with even pace just behind the revival of personal religion under Whitefield and Wesley. There was a shedding forth of the fragrance of tender buds; the time of the singing of birds had come.

This article deals with the English antislavery movement only. A West Indian planter, sojourning at Liverpool, had with him a slave, Benjamin Somerset. Such sojourn with slaves in England was not a new thing. Gilbert, of Antigua, had lately brought there two slaves, and these, converted like their master, had with him returned as slaves, though now "brethren beloved," the three afterward planting Methodism in their island. But Somerset's case was acute. He fell sick, and his master turned him out to die in the street. A good Samaritan, Granville Sharpe, when he came where he was, picked the wretch up and had him nursed to health. Then the master reclaimed his slave, and Sharpe entered suit for the man's freedom. The court found the case perplexing. It was then two hundred years since under Elizabeth the con-

dition of "unfree," the last trace of slavery, had vanished from England, though it yet lingered among the coal mines of Scotland, while there were presumptions and legal precedents, even the decision of a chief justice, for its recognition *in transitu*. After long study Lord Mansfield found slavery alien to the English Constitution and admissible by statute only. No enabling statute existed; therefore slavery did not exist, and Somerset was free. March 25, 1772, is a day greatly to be remembered as the time when mankind's *Magna Charta* was promulgated, of wider meaning and of working more energetic than the torn and time-stained document in the British Museum bearing the rough, reluctant penmanship of King John. Then up rose Cowper as *vates*, and sang:

> Slaves cannot breathe in England; if their lungs
> Receive our air, that moment they are free;
> They touch our country, and their shackles fall.
> That's noble, and bespeaks a nation proud
> And jealous of the blessing. Spread it, then,
> . . . . . .
> . . . that where Britain's power
> Is felt, mankind may feel her mercy too.

Cowper's words came to the quick ear of a boy in his early teens, at school in Hull. He was no vulgar lad. The only son of a wealthy home he, like Cromwell, disproves the notion that a boy reared among sisters lacks manliness. His frame, dwarfed and deformed, was glorified by a face on which was set every seal to give the world assurance of a man. Even at seven his teacher would stand him on a table to read to the school, so accurate was his taste, and his voice flexibly tuneful, fit to utter an angel's message. This lad, with fresh, generous ardor, at once took as his theme for a school exercise, "Is It Right to Hold Human Beings in Slavery?" The boy was father of the man, and uttered the keynote of his life's diapason. He went to Cambridge where Milton and Cromwell had walked, and, in our century, Gladstone. At twenty-one he was in control of an ample fortune, and the world was wide before him for the choosing of a career. He was humane and patriotic, though not yet a Christian. Determining upon public service, he became a candidate for Parliament.

Such candidacy was then a peculiar affair, and, indeed, so

was Parliament itself. Noblemen owned two thirds of the Commons, the Duke of Norfolk alone owning eleven members. Old Sarum, a borough without an inhabitant, sent two members. The County of Bute had but one voter. This important person with due dignity took the chair, called order, made and seconded his own nomination, recorded his own vote, and announced himself unanimously elected. In the unowned constituencies, during the six weeks given to the voting, the struggle was often fierce, and the campaign revelry wild enough. Men with basins of guineas—this from an eyewitness—stood frankly bidding for votes; and in the "Mad Canvass" half a million was spent, while Georgiana, the beautiful duchess of Devonshire, won a butcher's vote for a kiss on her own proud cheek. Reform, sorely needed, was long in coming; but could our bosses well rise up to condemn the English "statesmen" of old? Is it not into politics that decency last comes?

Six weeks of hustings called for great exertions and fifty thousands of money. Wilberforce's sister gave a new gown to the wife of every elector who voted for her brother. "Miss Wilberforce forever!" they shouted, as she came upon the platform. "Thank you!" she answered; "but I am not sure that I wish to be Miss Wilberforce forever!" Her brother, thus elected, sat for Hull—and afterward for its County of York—nearly fifty years with merely nominal opposition. Going up to London, young, wealthy, and accomplished, he found society attractive and himself soon one of its attractions. He gained the regard of Burke, and Pitt, sad and heavy-laden, found comfort in his love. He won the confidence of England's best, but those days were perilous, though a tender conscience kept him from drifting. Thus, one evening at cards, of which he was passionately fond, he gained, from a man ill able to lose, a thousand pounds. Reflecting on this, he resolved never to play again, a resolution rarely made by a winner.

In 1785, while traveling on the Continent with Milner, the devout teacher of his boyhood, he formally gave heart and life to Christ. He was converted, and, from that day, Carlyle's saying of Cromwell—"Oliver will henceforth believe in God at

all times and in all cases"—held true of William Wilberforce. Ready now with energies like those of some mythic hero, divinely reinforced for every good word and work, he the next year brought in the forerunner of emancipation, the Bill for the Abolition of the African Slave Trade. His introducing speech, full, clear, and earnest with his charm of tone and countenance, put him among the masters of appeal, and gained the support of the best around him. The slave trade was a great vested interest, and its defenders were fierce and strong, yet its assailant never lost heart or hope. Wesley strengthened himself upon his bed, and his heart, as with an engine's expiring throbs, impelled his staggering fingers to the last of his many thousand manuscripts, a heartening note to Wilberforce. Troublous times came on. France belched forth the Revolution, the Napoleonic wars, the hindering at Santo Domingo. The stress of politics was long and stormy, and over this bill were twenty years of struggle. Wilberforce refreshed this long test of faith by side activities of patriotism and benevolence. In 1797 he launched the first formal society for foreign missions, and for its balance he framed the society for ameliorating the condition of the poor of London—fair harbinger of like kindly enterprises to follow. Thus, while his efforts for man's welfare were not shut up to England, his charity blessed the spot of its origin, and his voice, his presence, and his money responded to every cry of darkness and suffering.

Wearying were the toils, the delays, the advances, and recoils that occupied so much of his lifetime. His health became infirm. "At thirty," he says, "I have the constitution of sixty." His eyesight was failing, yet his moral energy was lush, and the light in his spirit undimmed. Gifted sons grew up around him. One "Soapy Sam, always in hot water and always coming out with clean hands," became a distinguished bishop. On with his central task he struggled, gathering at last his arguments into a book that might, like Moses's song, serve others should entrance upon his heart's desire be denied to himself. Just then came victory. On March 16, 1807, after twenty years of effort, the House decreed that "no vessel should clear for slaves from a British port after May 1, 1807, or slave be landed therein after March 1, 1808." The Lords

changed "therein" to "in any country, territory, or place," and this the House at once accepted. The time was critical, for the king was about to change his ministers, and a new ministry meant delay, perhaps hindrance and baffling. Lord Grenville's last service was, by his Majesty's order, to affix to this act the king's seal, making it law. The clock was just striking twelve, and the full-orbed sun beamed upon this royal sanction of a *Magna Charta* for Africa. Reason and humanity had won in the long fight against cruelty and greed, and the victory came to stay. Grenville called it "the most glorious measure ever adopted by any legislative body in the world," and Bishop Watson said, "This great act of justice will be recorded in heaven."

It was high time. The African slave trade, as lawful European commerce, had begun in 1481. In three and a quarter centuries it had swept from four million square miles of equatorial Africa ten millions of human beings. In 1800, one hundred and ninety-two English vessels with remorseless energy were bringing to the West Indies forty thousand slaves a year, as many dying on the passage—and then, the primal havoc in their African home! The *Mayflower* had in the same year landed freedom in New England and African slavery in Virginia—wheat and tares to grow together until the blazing harvest of the Rebellion, with misery to glean thereafter. The next year after Wilberforce's triumph saw America declare the slave trade piracy and slavers enemies of the human race. As surely as sunrise follows dawn, the abolition of slavery was to follow the abolition of the slave trade. Wilberforce had intimated as much by announcing in 1792 a bill with that intention; and when George III had stamped as law the former, the latter moved to the fore. Storms in England and on the Continent grew loud and angry, but with angelic courage Wilberforce used the forces of the storm. He loyally and earnestly solicited every ministry, every Parliament, every great general. He made personal appeal to the czar, to the King of Prussia, to the sovereigns who met in 1814. For twenty years he toiled unhasting, unresting for what he saw afar, the to him divine event of his life. Then his health gave way, and he resigned from Parliament, Sir Fowell Buxton,

"the member for abolition," became the coryphæus of the drama, while Brougham, who had once written a defense of slavery, and many others rose responsive.

Wilberforce—while, like Priam's venerable counselors, he looked out upon the strife—gave to quiet benevolence the remnant of his strength, making many a widow's heart to sing, and warming to a smile many a face of sickness and sorrow. Like a stream of his level Yorkshire with calm, soft flow he kept the margins of his life green. At length he laid down on the bed from which he was not to rise, when, as with a sudden sunset glow, came his bright, consummate hour. Forty-one years after his introducing it the Bill for Emancipation passed. On that day, Friday, July 26, 1833, his tongue could but feebly utter the thoughts that arose in his heart. "Thank God," he exclaimed, "that I have lived to see the day!"

On Monday he ascended to the home of the loving, the pure, the brave, to give answer of a life of "Practical Religion" on which he had once written a book, and which he had early and late, publicly and privately, illustrated. One who had long known him said, "He deserved to be reckoned as one of the twelve." "Unaided," says Sir James Stephens, "by place, by party, or by the sword, he had by paths till then untrodden reached a social and political eminence never before attained by any man." No funeral like his had ever been seen in England. Two royal coaches attested the formal and comely grief of the palace over one who had served so loyally in the kingdom's fiercest trials and who had shed on the State so wide and tender a light of personal and public benevolence. The most illustrious of peers and commoners walked in the mourning train, while the poor of Hull and London wept and later, as the tidings came, the eyes of many a slave glistened with his share of the far-away sorrow. Westminster Abbey, the noblest of earthly burial places, swung wide its historic doors and opened for him its marbles covering royal dust,

> While through the long-drawn aisle and fretted vault
> The swelling anthem pealed its notes of praise.

The bill ordered final and absolute freedom for August 1, 1840. At St. John's, Antigua, in the largest church of the

island, the negroes on the night of July 31 kept watch with prayer and praise and joyous agony of expectation. At midnight all knelt in silence to receive as from heaven the boon of freedom. At the stroke of twelve a sudden tropic cloud gave from the sky a startling flash and peal, as if heaven with the fire and trumpet of Sinai were announcing the first emancipation of the century and the world. Then, like a volcano's burst, came out the African temper in shouts and songs, in leaping and wildest tossing, in a frenzy of gratitude and gladness. This spent itself, and the waning night was given to Scripture, counsel, and meditation. The morning came, and in the fresh, early light—as on the Red Sea strand of old—stood a people free, eight hundred thousand strong.

Such a life as was that of Wilberforce! Shedding such color and fragrance on a world sorely needing it all! Fit to be taken to

> The everlasting gardens,
> Where angels walk and seraphs are the wardens,
> Where every flower that passes death's dark portal
> Becomes immortal.

A. B. Hyde

Art. V.—DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE IN ISLAM.

The teaching of the Koran on this subject is, on the whole, somewhat deficient. Not so Mohammedan tradition and systematic theology, however. From these sources we may gather a great deal of information. The different witnesses may not be mutually consistent at times, any more than are the witnesses for our Christian eschatology. Nevertheless, taking our materials as we find them, we discover, after all, a fairly definite unity in essentials.

To look, first, at the doctrine of the Koran, death in itself is a solemn event which men may justly dread.* None may escape death.† Consideration of that which awaits respective individuals in the next world makes the prospect of dying either more or less terrible, according to the character and works of those concerned. The moment of death is appointed, and can be neither hastened nor delayed. It is written down by God in his book of decrees.‡ The soul of the dying is taken away by angels.§ If it be that of a wicked man its torments begin on the day of death.‖ Probably the reward of the good was, in like manner, regarded by Mohammed as beginning immediately after death. Prayers for the dead at the tomb are recognized, though there are some persons for whom one must not thus pray.¶

In elaboration of this doctrine of the Mohammedan scriptures Mohammedan theologians teach much more on the sufficient warrant of tradition. There is an angel of death, Azrael,** commanded by the Most High to take away at the decreed moment the soul of each one living. From Azrael another angel receives the disembodied spirit and carries it up to God. God briefly and in a general way interrogates the soul before him, and it is then returned to the body to occupy it, but not to animate it. The soul goes with the body to the tomb, and the night after burial undergoes a frightful inquisition from two dread angels, Munkar and Nakir. If the result

* Koran, 3, 137; 5, 105. † *Ibid.*, 3, 182. ‡ *Ibid.*, 3, 138.
§ *Ibid.*, 6, 93. ‖ *Ibid.* ¶ *Ibid.*, 9, 85.
** So the gospel of Barnabas; Macbride, *Mohammedan Religion Explained*, p. 127.

of their examination be satisfactory, the individual is comforted in view of the final judgment, and is given a foretaste of Paradise. If the reverse, he is made to undergo anticipatory tortures until the day of judgment. To the examination of the tomb children, being held irresponsible, are not subjected. The theology of Islam also goes on to speak of the signs of the last day. It relates that at the first blast of the resurrection angel's trumpet all the living will die, including the angel himself. After a period of forty years God will raise the resurrection angel, who will sound his trumpet again and bring all the dead back to life. Following the resurrection comes the general judgment.

After this brief outline—which we have given for clearness' sake, though it anticipates what follows—we may seek to learn more particularly what Islam teaches as to our subject. Some accounts of the deaths of Mohammedan saints give us ground for supposing that the separation of the soul from the body was looked upon as a terrible trial. The man who can endure without murmuring the pangs of death departs with greatly increased merit. Mohammed is represented as saying that "death is enough to cause overwhelming grief and sorrow." And the angel Gabriel says, by way of rejoinder, "That which follows death is far more dreadful than dying."* In the Shiah manual, *Hyat-ul-Kuloob*, a saint in Paradise is represented as giving an account of his death. He declares that cutting the body to pieces many times with shears is easier than the agony of dying. Azrael, the angel of death, gigantic in size and awful in appearance, appeared before him in the air. By distinct signs he took away his sight, hearing, and speech. The pleading remonstrances of the dying man availed nothing. Azrael's reply to them was that the decreed moment had come and he was commanded to accomplish his death. Before the soul was drawn out of the body the man's two recording angels appeared, bringing the book of his deeds which they had written down. The angel Rakib presented to him the part containing the record of his good actions, while the other part with the record of evil actions

* Merrick, *Life and Religion of Mohammed as Contained in the Sheeah Traditions of the Hyat-ul-Kuloob*, p. 193 f.

was laid before him by the angel Atîd. He was told that his good works outweighed the evil, and was comforted with the assurance that he would enter Paradise. Azrael now came nearer to the man and began to draw gradually his soul from his body. Every pull he made was equal in agony to all the pains under heaven. Finally, when the spirit had been drawn up to the heart, Azrael drew it by force from the man's nostrils. After being disembodied the spirit remained near by long enough to hear the lamentations of the man's family. Then came another angel and received from the angel of death the man's spirit. This, having bound in a silk garment, he took to heaven in less than the twinkling of an eye, and placed it near the Lord. God then examined the spirit as to its deeds and devotion when in the body. After this questioning it was conveyed to the body again, and remained with it while preparations were being made for the burial. It also went with the body to the tomb. There the soul sorrowed that it could not return to the world and its former life, and was rebuked by the angel Membah, who is appointed to take charge of all men and to punish them after death until they write down the acts of their life as a testimony before God. This angel set the dead man upright and bade him write down his deeds. He had forgotten them, but Membah recalled them, and he made the record at the angel's dictation. For paper the man used a part of his robe, which had been changed to that material; for pen, his index finger; and for ink, his spittle. When the writing was finished Membah sealed it up and bound it as a yoke about the neck of the dead (Koran, 17, 14, 15), where it was felt to be heavier than all the mountains of the world.* Of this Shiah account of the agony of death and the visit of Membah it is probable that the main elements are accepted among the orthodox Moslems.

After Membah had left the tomb, and during the night following the funeral, there occurred the "examination of the tomb." The inquisitors were the angels Munkar and Nakir. They are two beings of awful aspect and tremendous voice. In his hand Munkar bears an iron mace of great size and

* Merrick, *Life and Religion of Mohammed*, p. 362 ff.

weight. Having caused the body to sit upright,* they proceed to question the man as to his faith. The Shiah tradition makes each angel put the dead through a separate examination.† The subjects of the interrogation are the man's god, his prophet, his religion, and his *qibla* (the point toward which he turns his face in prayer). To these the Shiites add a question as to his *imam*—leader in worship and religion.‡ The answer of a believer to these questions is that his god is Allah, his prophet Mohammed, his religion Islam, his *qibla* the Kaaba (the temple at Mecca). The true Shiah's answer to their additional query is that Ali (son-in-law of Mohammed) is his *imam*.§ To such as answer favorably the angels of this "first judgment" ‖ give comforting assurance of their being cleared at the final judgment, and being permitted to enter Paradise.¶ The body is then put back into its former position. Hell is opened at its feet and Paradise at its head, that it may know what it has escaped and what it has gained. Hell is then closed and the gate to Paradise opened, so that there comes through to the resting believer the perfumes of the celestial gardens.** The unbeliever in this process of inquisition will be unable to answer his examiners. They will proceed to beat him about the temples with iron maces, and will crush his body by pressing the earth down upon it. Some say that the body will be gnawed and stung by ninety-nine seven-headed dragons, while others declare that the unbeliever's sins will become beasts, biting like dragons, scorpions, and serpents according to their several degrees of heinousness.†† This judgment of the grave and the torture of the unjust in the grave must be acknowledged by all Moslems to be real and just.‡‡

The majority of the orthodox teach that, in the case of all responsible persons, there is at the close of the funeral ceremonies §§ at the grave an instruction (*talkîn*) of the deceased by a *fakîh*, or "doctor," who is called the *mulak-*

* Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, Minerva edition, p. 56. † Merrick, p. 364 f.
‡ *Ibid.* § *Ibid.* ‖ Macbride, p. 131.
¶ Garcier de Tassy, *Foi Musulmane*, p. 16. ** Comp. Merrick, as before.
†† Sale, *Preliminary Discourse*, sec. iv.
‡‡ Macbride, p. 131; al-Ghazzâlî in Ockley, *History of the Saracens*. Bohn edition, p. 76. §§ Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, II, p. 191.

kin, "instructor." This man tells the dead man of the approaching visit of the angels of inquisition, of the questions which they will put to him, and of the replies which he should give. The *mulakkin* informs the departed that, should he answer satisfactorily, the inquisitors will say to him after their examination, "Sleep, O servant of God, in the protection of God." The Malikite sect of orthodox Moslems does not believe in this instruction of the dead. The night after burial is called "*Lailat el-wahshah*," or "night of desolation," because the man's place in his home is left vacant; it is, also, called "*Lailat el-wahdah*," or "night of solitude," because of his solitary watch in the tomb until the angel inquisitors come.*

At the house of the deceased, after the last evening prayer of the day of burial, there is performed a ceremony called the *Sebhah*, or "rosary." A large company of *fakîhs* come to the house, one of them having with him a rosary consisting of one thousand beads, each of them as large as a pigeon's egg. The exercises consist of the recitation of special chapters of the Koran and of some liturgical formulas; the repetition three thousand times—three rounds of the rosary—of the sentence "There is no god but Allah;" other sentences repeated many times; and, finally, the recitation of other Koran verses. All this having been accomplished, one of the company asks his fellows if they have transferred the merit of what they have done to the person who has died. They answer by repeating a formula of affirmation. This completes the *Sebhah*. The aim of the rite is to help the deceased to find an easy entrance into Paradise.† The idea is that with the merit sent on to him he will be the better prepared to meet the first judgment of the grave and the final judgment of the last day.‡

The *Sebhah* in Mecca is somewhat different from what we have given above. There, those who take part are friends of the dead, though *fakîhs* may be hired to assist in the recitation of the Koran. It is not necessary, apparently, to recite particular passages of the Koran, the aim being to complete, by adding together what the respective participants in the

* Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, p. 484 f.
† *Ibid.*, p. 486 f.
‡ Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, p. 191.

ceremony have recited, the equivalent of one whole recitation of the book (*Chatma*).*

What is the condition of the departed after the examination of the grave? After the first night in the tomb the souls of the good go to the place of good spirits, to await the day of resurrection, while the souls of the wicked go to the dungeon appointed for them.† More particularly, it is taught that the great host of God's prophets, without examination either in the tomb or at the last day, enter at death into Paradise.‡ The souls of the martyrs who die fighting in the wars of Islam are lodged in the crops of green birds, which feed on the fruits of Paradise. As to the spirits of ordinary believers, there is a difference of opinion concerning their abode between the two judgments. Tradition relates that the Prophet when passing near the grave of a believer would salute his spirit hovering close by.§ This view—that the spirit remains near the grave—is a widespread belief among Moslems. Tradition having also related that Mohammed in his famous night journey saw in the first or lowest of the seven heavens Adam with the souls elected to Paradise on his right hand and those doomed to Gehenna at his left, some have taught that the souls of ordinary believers are in the lowest heaven with Adam until the resurrection. Another view, which is said to be regarded as heretical and yet is declared to be widely held, is that the souls of believers are in the holy well, Zemzem, connected with the sacred mosque at Mecca, while the spirits of the wicked are confined in a well in Hadramaut called Barahout. A fourth opinion is that souls remain near the grave for seven days, and that they then go no one knows whither. A fifth belief is that all souls are in the trumpet of Israfil, the angel of the resurrection. Finally, there is an opinion that the spirits of the good, in the form of white birds, are lodging under God's throne. As to the souls of the wicked, the view that they are in Barahout is not the most prevalent one. The orthodox hold that the souls of unbelievers are offered by the angels to heaven, but are refused because they are evil-smelling and filthy. They are then tendered to earth and are there rejected. The

* *Mekka*, ii., p. 192.

† Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, p. 48.

‡ Al-Ghazzâlî cited by Ockley, *History of the Saracens*, p. 76; Macbride, p. 131.

§ Macbride, p. 131.

angels then carry them down to the seventh earth below and cast them into the dungeon Sijjîn, which is under a green rock —some say, under the devil's jaw. In this abode they will be tormented until they are brought to judgment.*

We may consider next the signs of the last day. The authorities diverge from one another very greatly in regard to these. Perhaps we may regard the following as generally acknowledged. The appearance of ad-Dajjâl, the Antichrist; the descent from heaven of the prophet Jesus the Messiah, who will slay ad-Dajjâl and will become a Moslem; the appearance of the Mahdi and his meeting with Jesus; the coming of Gog and Magog and of the Beast of the earth; and the rising of the sun in the west. The Mahdi will bear the name "Mohammed." He will fill the earth with righteousness, and will be the vicar of Jesus.† Gog and Magog are looked upon as northern peoples who were restrained from invading the South by a wall constructed by Alexander the Great from the Caucasus to the Caspian Sea. The Beast of the earth will be of enormous size, composite nature, and inconceivably swift.‡ He will bring with him the rod of Moses and the seal of Solomon. With the rod he will touch upon the face both believer and unbeliever, writing upon their respective countenances "Mumin" or "Mushrik"—"believer," "unbeliever." Some authorities assert that the whole number of signs of the last day will be twelve, six in this world and six in the unseen world.§ Others enumerate seventeen signs.‖

The teaching of Mohammedan theology on the subject of the resurrection is as follows: The resurrection angel, Israfil, has his great trumpet, resembling a horn, to his lips unceasingly, waiting for the command to sound from God Most High. At the instant God orders it Israfil will blow a terrible blast which will fill with its sound all heaven and earth. On hearing it, all the living, including the angel himself, will die. For forty years the world will remain without life. God will then raise Israfil from the dead. The angel will again blow

* Sale, *Preliminary Discourse*, sec. iv; comp. Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, p. 485 f.
† De Tassy, *Foi Musulmane*, p. 16 (comp. also notes 27-30); Palmer, *Qur'ân*, Part I, p. lxxi, Intr. ‡ Merrick, p. 451 f.
§ Arnold, *Chrestom. Arabica*, p. 194, l. 1 ff.
‖ Merrick, p. 451 ff.; comp. Sale, *Preliminary Discourse*, sec. iv.

his trumpet and all the dead will rise.* We are told that the first blast of the trumpet will so disturb the order of the world that God will have to put all in order again before the angel gives the signal for the general resurrection. At the resurrection all will rise absolutely naked, but they will be so preoccupied with the awful issues of the moment as to be entirely oblivious to the fact. All the good will, however, find at hand coats of Paradise with which to clothe themselves and horses of Paradise on which to ride. Arrayed and mounted they will then make their way to the shadow of God's judgment throne and will await their trial there. The wicked, on the other hand, will be forced to make their way to the judgment seat naked, on foot, starving, and wasted. The sun will beat upon them, until, according to their several degrees of wickedness, their perspiration reaches in its depth to the ankle, the knee, the mouth, or the crown of the head; that is, each will be in a pool of perspiration, one pool being shallower, another deeper. Thus they are said to remain for fifty thousand years. The transition from resurrection to judgment is found in the delivery to each man of his book of recorded deeds. The believer receives his book in his right hand, whereas the unbeliever is given his in his left hand or behind his back.†

We may now be thought to have reached the utmost limit of our subject, for, following what has just been described is the great event of the last judgment. This teaching of Islam regarding death and the intermediate state will suggest to all readers analogies in Christian theological systems. The ceremony of the *Sebhah* reminds one of the masses said for the dead, though there is in the Mohammedan rite that which is not in the mass. The aim is to send on merit to the dead, while the mass is merely meritorious on behalf of the dead. Too rigid an exegesis of Heb. ix, 27, "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment," might originate a doctrine very like the Mohammedan doctrine of the judgment of the grave. We are told that the Barbary Jews believe in angels who record the good and evil actions of men and bring these records to their owners after death. The

* De Tassy, p. 8 f. † *Ibid.*, p. 17.

good angel pleads the good deeds and the evil angel the evil deeds, and destiny is held to be decided by the prevailing of the one advocate over the other. Following this trial the individual is transferred to angels of award, who reward or punish him in accordance with the issue of the trial.*

The Moslem evidently held to a material conception of the soul. It is represented as localized in the body, as bursting a vein in its exit from the body, or as being drawn out of the body through the nostrils. We do not, however, forget that our theology speaks of a spiritual body, though none dares to say exactly what is meant by the expression.

The teaching of Islam is that there are degrees of blessedness or wretchedness in the intermediate state, corresponding to the degrees of merit and demerit of those who enter therein. The blessed enjoy different kinds of entertainment in Paradise,† and a distinction is made between the favor shown to prophets, martyrs, and ordinary believers. On the other hand, the sins of the wicked bite like serpents, scorpions, or dragons, according to their heinousness.

The reappearance of the dead to the living is a definite Moslem belief. The apparition occurs oftenest in sleep, but is not entirely confined to that state.

The Moslem teaching as to the resurrection is suggestive of the Apocalypse. This article of the faith of Islam is a very prominent one, and is abundantly used, by way of moral encouragement or warning, both in and out of the Koran. The resurrection angel Israfil is the great throne-bearer, who carries God's throne on the nape of his neck, while his feet rest on the seventh earth below.‡

In closing, it is to be acknowledged that the materials of Mohammedan teaching on the subjects we have been discussing are largely borrowed from Judaism and Christianity. They have been worked over into new forms and connections, however, by Mohammed and the doctors of Islam, until they now wear an aspect which entirely harmonizes with the original elements of Moslem theology.

* Merrick, p. 449. † *Ibid.*, p. 194 ff. ‡ Arnold, *Chrestom. Arabica*, p. 195.

Walter A. Patton

Art. VI.—MYSTICISM IN TENNYSON.

In his interesting comparison of Tennyson and Browning Professor Dowden says: "Accordingly, although we find the idea of God entering largely into the poetry of Mr. Tennyson, there is little recognition of special contact of the soul with the divine Being in any supernatural way of quiet or of ecstasy." And then the professor adds: "This precludes all spiritual rapture, that glorious folly, that heavenly madness, wherein true wisdom is acquired. Wordsworth in some of his solitary trances of thought really entered into the frame of mind which the mystic knows as union or as ecstasy, when thought expires into enjoyment. With Mr. Tennyson the mystic is always the visionary who suffers from an overexcitable fancy. The nobler aspects of the mystical religious spirit are unrepresented in his poetry." Undoubtedly Mr. Dowden is right in the main, in his contention that the nobler aspects of the mystical religious spirit are more noticeable in Wordsworth or Browning than in Tennyson; but to say that they are not represented in his poetry is very far from the truth. We shall see, as we go along, that there are many passages in which the higher moods of the soul are expressed, and from the full and accurate memoir by his son we know that religious ecstasy was a very characteristic mood in Tennyson's life. In his letters and diary and in the reminiscences of his friends we have many prose commentaries on passages in his poetry.

Hallam Tennyson himself says of the experience of the poet in the respect indicated:

> Throughout his life he had a constant feeling of a spiritual harmony existing between ourselves and the outward visible universe, and of the actual immanence of God in the infinitesimal atom as the vastest system. He would say, "The soul seems to me one with God; how, I cannot tell." He wrote to a friend at one time: "A kind of waking trance I have frequently had, quite up from boyhood, when I have been all alone. This has generally come through repeating my own name two or three times to myself silently till all at once, as it were out of the intensity of the consciousness of individuality, the individuality itself seemed to dissolve and fade away into boundless being; and this, not a confused

state, but the clearest of the clearest, the surest of the surest, the weirdest of the weirdest, utterly beyond words, where death was almost a laughable impossibility—the loss of personality, if so it were, seeming no extinction, but the only true life." This might, he said, be the state which St. Paul describes, "whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell." He was ashamed of such a feeble description, for his experience under such circumstances was altogether incommunicable.

In 1869, while writing "The Holy Grail," he also made to his family the following significant utterance:

> Yes, it is true that there are moments when the flesh is nothing to me, when I feel and know the flesh to be the vision, God and the spiritual the only real and true. Depend upon it, the spiritual is the real; it belongs to one more than the hand and the foot. You may tell me that my hand and my foot are only imaginary symbols of my existence. I could believe you; but you never, never can convince me that the I is not an eternal reality, and that the spiritual is not the true and real part of me.

These words he spoke with such passionate earnestness that a solemn silence fell on the family as he left the room. In a letter to Emily Sellwood, who afterward became his wife, he also says:

> To me, often, the far-off world seems nearer than the present, for in the present is always something unreal and indistinct; but the other seems a good solid planet, rolling around its green hills and paradises to the harmony of more steadfast laws. There steam up from about me mists of weakness, or sin, or despondency, and roll between me and the far planets, but it is there still.

As he grew older Tennyson felt more and more the reality of the unseen. Edward Fitzgerald gives this interesting observation:

> I remember A. T. admiring the abstracted look of a Murillo Madonna at Dulwich, the eyes of which are on you, but seem "looking at something beyond, beyond the actual into abstraction." This has been noticed of some great men; it is the trance of the seer. I do not remember seeing it in A. T. himself, great as he was from top to toe, and his eyes dark, powerful, and severe.

But Fitzgerald afterward changed his mind, and wrote: "I have seen it in his (A. T.'s). Some American spoke of the same in Wordsworth." Yes, with Tennyson's deepening life

came a greater realization of the transcendent moods of the human soul, a greater spiritual power that expressed itself in the eye and tone of voice, and more elevated poetry. Speaking of him two years before his death his son says:

> While he talked of the mystery of the universe his face, full of the strong lines of thought, was lighted up, and his words glowed as it were with inspiration. In 1888 we are told that during the day he lay on his sofa, near the south window of his study, and told us that looking out on the great landscape he had wonderful thoughts about God and the universe, and felt as if looking into the other world.

All of these passages, and others that might be quoted, show that not always, perhaps, but in his greater moments Tennyson did know something of that heavenly madness wherein true wisdom is acquired. He did not look upon the mystic as a visionary who suffers from an overexcitable fancy. He was terribly in earnest about the significance of such moments in his life. He said, with something of the same vigor that he used in speaking of immortality: "By God Almighty there is no delusion in the matter. It is no nebulous ecstasy but a state of transcendent wonder associated with absolute clearness of mind."

And yet Tennyson was far from being a spiritualist. We have an account of a conversation between him and his brother Frederick, in which he said:

> I grant you that spiritualism must not be judged by its quacks; but I am convinced that God and the ghosts of men would choose something other than mere table legs through which to speak to the heart of man. You tell me that my duty is to give up everything, in order to propagate spiritualism. There is really too much flummery mixed up with it, supposing, as I am inclined to believe, there is something in it.

It may be seen from this that Tennyson had little sympathy with the extreme views of many modern mystics. His mysticism was based upon reality.

Perhaps the best short statement of Tennyson's faith in the unseen is found in "The Higher Pantheism." He wrote it for the Metaphysical Society of London, and meant it, no doubt, as a protest against the materialism and agnosticism of many of the members of that interesting organization. It is full of the idealism of Plato and Goethe:

> The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills, and the plains—
> Are not these, O soul, the vision of Him who reigns?

With this God, of whom we catch but broken gleams, we can hold personal communion:

> Speak to him, thou, for he hears, and spirit with spirit can meet—
> Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

These lines might serve as the commentary on the ninety-fourth canto of "In Memoriam," which is an account of the mingling of Tennyson's soul with the universal soul in a moment of transcendent ecstasy or rapture. The passage has been very much misunderstood. In the first edition it read:

> And all at once it seem'd at last
> His living soul was flash'd on mine,
> And mine in his was wound, and whirl'd
> About empyreal heights of thought.

Unquestionably the logic of the preceding cantos was in favor of this reading, but in a later edition Tennyson changed it so that it has a much wider application. It comes as the climax of a long line of thought and feeling. After he has considered the questions of immortality and fame and has longed, as few men have longed, for the spirit of Hallam, one summer night as he reads the letters of his dead friend he is lifted up into the spiritual world. All that has gone before has prepared him for the realization in a supreme degree of the spirit of God in his soul:

> And all at once it seem'd at last
> The living soul was flash'd on mine,
>
> And mine in this was wound, and whirl'd
> About empyreal heights of thought,
> And came on that which is, and caught
> The deep pulsations of the world,
>
> Æonian music measuring out The steps of time.
>
> Vague words! but ah, how hard to frame
> In matter-molded forms of speech,
> Or ev'n for intellect to reach
> Thro' memory that which I became.

In "The Two Voices" we have many suggestions of Wordsworth's "Intimations of Immortality." The argument for a preexistence is tentatively advanced; at least the man

uses it as an answer to the first voice, which says that to begin implies an ending. In certain great moments of life there are impressions that seem to carry us back, as in a trance, to that imperial palace whence we came before God shut the doorway of the head. One does feel, now and then, emotions that connect him with a world other than this. Such moments correspond to the calm weather of Wordsworth:

> Some vague emotion of delight
> In gazing up an Alpine height,
> Some yearning toward the lamps of night;
> . . . . . .
> Moreover, something is or seems,
> That touches me with mystic gleams,
> Like glimpses of forgotten dreams—
>
> Of something felt, like something here;
> Of something done, I know not where;
> Such as no language may declare.

Another poem in which the rapture of the human soul is finely expressed is "The Ancient Sage." That the experience described in it is not altogether dramatic is proved by the words of Tyndall. One night Tyndall, Jowett, and Tennyson were talking together. Says Tyndall:

> Tennyson described to me a state of consciousness into which he could throw himself by thinking intensely of his own name. It was an apparent isolation of the spirit from the body. Wishing doubtless to impress upon me the reality of the phenomena, he exclaimed that it was a state of transcendent wonder. This trance, he claimed, was a union with God such as that described by Plotinus and Porphyry, and is the best argument against materialism and in favor of personal immortality.

A few months after this conversation Tyndall saw that he had given expression to the same idea in "The Ancient Sage." In the poem an old sage, a thousand summers before the time of Christ, is talking with a reckless, doubting, skeptical young man who has in his hands a poem expressing the vanity of life and the darkness of the world. Against the words of the poem the ancient seer pleads for the Nameless, notwithstanding the fact that his existence cannot be proved; he believes also in the final triumph of the good, and that the doors of night are the gates of light:

> And more, my son! for more than once when I
> Sat all alone, revolving in myself
> The word that is the symbol of myself,
> The mortal limit of the Self was loosed,
> And passed into the Nameless, as a cloud
> Melts into heaven. I touch'd my limbs, the limbs
> Were strange, not mine—and yet no shade of doubt,
> But utter clearness, and thro' loss of self
> The gain of such large life as match'd with ours
> Were sun to spark—unshadowable in words,
> Themselves but shadows of a shadow world.

He closes his rapturous address to the young man, who can no longer reply to him, with words that are a suggestion of the Transfiguration on Mount Hermon:

> But curb the beast would cast thee in the mire,
> And leave the hot swamp of voluptuousness,
> A cloud between the Nameless and thyself,
> And lay thine uphill shoulder to the wheel,
> And climb the Mount of Blessing, whence, if thou
> Look higher, then—perchance—thou mayest—beyond
> A hundred ever-rising mountain lines,
> And past the range of night and shadow—see
> The high-heaven dawn of more than mortal day
> Strike on the Mount of Vision!

Is this vague mysticism, we ask; and we answer again, with great emphasis, No. It is the genuine mysticism of Wordsworth and Browning. Tennyson has given us in his poetry many expressions of a false mysticism. He understood, as few men have, the evil that may come from false ideas of religion, and has entered his protest in memorable words against a hollow idealism.

The poem "Saint Simeon Stylites" must occur to anyone in thinking on this subject. If one has always thought of Tennyson as a *dilettante* poet—faultily faultless, icily regular—he surely has not read this vigorous and healthy poem. We see St. Simeon on his pillar of stone, from scalp to sole one crust of sin, and hear him "battering the gates of heaven with storms of prayer," long as he yearns for the white robes and the palms that will atone for all of this self-mortification and torture. Even now, at times, he sees an angel standing watching; his one great object is to subdue his flesh that he may be more alone with God:

> Is that the angel there
> That holds a crown? Come, blessed brother, come!
> I know thy glittering face. I waited long.

This is his beatific vision—a vision of God that comes from denying this world and living on in the other—and we say with the poet that it is a hollow mockery.

The noble phases of the mediæval religion are presented in "Saint Agnes' Eve" and "Sir Galahad." Beautiful and romantic as these poems are, however, they suggest by way of contrast the healthier and saner religion of the poet and seer of the nineteenth century. From the casement of the monastery, in the first poem, the nun, looking out on the beautiful snow that envelops the earth, and at the stars that shed a mild beneficent light over all the winter scene, gets a vision of the Bridegroom. In "Sir Galahad" the vision of the Holy Grail afterward so finely developed in one of the idyls is suggested. All his heart is drawn above. Mightier transports than love move and thrill him. When at last he catches the vision of the Holy Grail he exclaims:

> My spirit beats her mortal bars.
> Ah, blessed vision! blood of God!

We are unavoidably reminded of the legend of the Holy Grail as interpreted by Tennyson. It is the idyl that is oftenest neglected and misunderstood, and yet it is in many senses the most significant of all; although it may lack the moving pathos of "Guinevere" or the solemn majesty of "Morte d'Arthur" and the beautiful narrative style of "Lancelot and Elaine," it is the idyl in which Tennyson has treated the religious problem of his age with greatest power. He himself regarded it as his highest utterance on life. It was the hardest one for him to write, but when it did come to him it came like the inspiration of a prophet. We doubt not that his difficulty in writing it was due to the greatness of the theme which he presents.

There are visions and visions in this idyl—trances, ecstasies, raptures. It is therefore an especially good illustration of the study we have been making. Not St. Francis of Assisi nor Abelard nor St. Augustine ever had more glorious visions of the blessed life or the city of God than Galahad and Perci-

vale and the holy nun. Other parts of the idyl do not so thoroughly reproduce the mediæval atmosphere out of which these legends came; but the religious fervor of the Middle Ages, that long-told story of the Holy Grail, is finely portrayed in this poem. It is not necessary to rehearse the story of the Holy Grail, but we shall only use so much of it as is needed for the understanding of the point at issue. The maid sister of Percivale, disappointed in love, turned her attention only to holy things. While passion was raging in Arthur's court—the terrible passion of unholy love—she held herself aloof from it all, and gave herself to fasting and alms. Her teacher had inspired her with zeal for a vision of the Holy Grail, and at last she catches a glimpse of it. Her eyes, beautiful in the light of holiness, shine with a glory never before known; she tells her brother of the sound as of a silver horn from over the hills. No music of earth was ever like it:

> And down the long beam stole the Holy Grail,
> Rose-red with beatings in it, as if alive,
> Till all the white walls of my cell were dyed
> With rosy colors leaping on the wall.

Galahad's eyes became like her own, when he heard of the vision—Galahad, the beautiful youth begotten by enchantment. He is sent forth by the maiden:

> Go forth, for thou shalt see what I have seen,
> And break thro' all, till one will crown thee king
> Far in the spiritual city.

When on a summer night the Holy Grail, clad in a luminous cloud, appeared to them all in a banquet hall, all the knights swore to follow it. In the tournament on the next day Galahad and Percivale were successful because strength was with them from the vision. The story is a long one of the disappointments of the various knights—their fruitless search for the vision, which appeared to them in so many different ways and at last brought gloom to their lives. The height of mediæval ecstasy is in Sir Galahad's vision as he passes away into the spiritual city, the veritable city of God that St. Augustine saw with his enraptured eye or that St. John beheld from Patmos. The vision had never failed from his sight, moving with him night and day. Through the night it

had been a veritable pillar of fire, and at last in a vision of glory it leads him to the throne of God. From the swamp and dark places of earth Percivale sees him passing to the spiritual city, with all her spires and gateways in a glory like one pearl.

> And from the star there shot
> A rose-red sparkle to the city, and there
> Dwelt, and I know it was the Holy Grail,
> Which never eyes on earth again shall see.

This is the ecstasy, the mysticism on which science and materialism have made their attack, and, noble as it is in Sir Galahad and in Percivale's sister—nobler far than the corruptions of social life which prevailed in King Arthur's court—it has too little of the reality of life to be of any permanent value to the human race.

But in striking contrast with these knights who pursued the Holy Grail is King Arthur himself with his purpose to build up a kingdom. He, too, had had a vision, but it was a vision to make the world other, and to build up the realm of Christ. It is this purpose that binds him to the life about him, and causes him to see at once the folly of his knights, when he learns of their vows. He realizes that for Galahad there may be such a vision. He will thus fulfill his nature, but the others will follow "wandering fires, lost in the quagmire." Men are they, and men's work they ought to do, with strength and will to right the wrongs of earth. What infinite pathos is in the king's words as he bids them farewell. His prophecy is fulfilled, as we have already seen, but what has been his work? He has tried with his few knights left to go on in his efforts to organize a kingdom, and help the suffering world. He is one of Carlyle's workmen, but is he no more? Is he the practical man of whom we hear so much in these days; has he no vision and faculty divine? Ambrosius is the purely practical man the other extreme from the erring knights. He loves the world about him. How close he is to mother earth and its frail humanity! He likes to mingle with the folks in the little village, and knows every honest face of theirs and every homely secret in their heart. He delights himself with all their sufferings and joys.

> He lives
> Like an old badger in his earth,
> With earth about him everywhere.

Now Arthur lives in a larger world than this. To the practical love of humanity that characterizes Ambrosius he adds something of the mystical sense of Galahad, and the two are blended in an all but perfect manhood. He has lived a great life; he has had deep feeling, high thought, divine purposes, and visions come to him. He has his moments of rapture and ecstasy when he is crowned in the spiritual city, and earth must fade, for heaven was there. It is all summed up in the concluding paragraph, words that need only to be read in the light of what has been said to be instantly understood.

> And many a time they come,
> Until this earth he walks on seems not earth,
> This light that strikes his eyeball is not light,
> This air that smites his forehead is not air
> But vision—yea, his very hand and foot—
> In moments when he feels he cannot die,
> And knows himself no vision to himself,
> Nor the high God a vision, nor that One
> Who rose again.

These words were in Tennyson's mind the summing up of all of Arthur's life, and his own. "'The Holy Grail' is one of the most imaginative in my poems," he once said; "I have expressed there my strong feeling as to the reality of the unseen. The end, when the king speaks of his work and of his visions, is intended to be the summing up of all in the highest note by the highest of human men. They are the central lines of the idyls."

Ervin Minas

Art. VII.—CHRISTIANITY NOT AN EVOLUTION.

With curiosity, as well as serious concern, the observer will notice the growing tendency of Christianity to do obeisance to science, and of theologians to cater to the spirit of worldly wisdom. Not the least of these tendencies is seen in the disposition to yield too much to science in accepting the theory of evolution as a settled fact; whereas, it is at best only a theory, and a theory on which even scientists themselves are by no means agreed, either as to the facts proved or the evolving principles and agents employed. It is not, however, the purpose of the present paper to deal with the claims of science that it has proved the theory of scientific evolution, but rather to point out the palpable error of many prominent theologians in applying the term "evolution" to Christianity, and in speaking as though it were a settled fact that it is an evolution. It is not necessary to mention any names in particular, as our various periodicals abound with instances of this mistake on the part of theological writers. In fact, it seems to be almost a "fad" to speak of Christianity in this way, and even our college professors are falling into the same error—if it be an error, as we shall endeavor to show in this paper.

It does not seem clear to many writers that this habit of so speaking of Christianity is practically robbing it of its divine and supernatural origin and relegating it to the realm of rationalism. Of course, this is farthest from the thought of most of those who speak in this way; but the logical effect on the mind of the rationalistic thinker may be quite different from that which the careless theologian intends to produce. We verily believe that this habit of speech is fostering the spirit of rationalism that has been so noticeable in these latter times. Is it not true that the Christian Church has been leaning too much toward the premature conclusions of speculative science? Is not this very way of speaking of Christianity an indication that there is such a tendency? If so, then we ought to carefully examine the ground of our statements, analyze the terms we use, and guard our language in dealing with the theological side of great questions.

In considering the inquiry as to whether Christianity is an evolution, it is necessary that we should ask what Christianity is. The term, as commonly employed, is somewhat indefinite in its meaning. Addressing ourselves for a moment to the question, we notice that it is not a mineral, vegetable, or animal product, and cannot have "evolved," on any scientific basis, out of either of these kingdoms. But, if it does not belong to either of these kingdoms, and cannot be treated by the laws governing them, then what is it? Positively, we may answer this question in the following ways:

1. It is a system of truth, including the nature, character, and mission of Christ, the eternal Logos, who is represented as God manifested in the flesh, in whom dwelt "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." As such, Christianity may be said to be a revelation.

2. It is a scheme of atonement for sin, provided by the divine Father for the redemption of mankind, and, as such, it is salvation.

3. It is a system of ethical principles and precepts for the guidance of human conduct, embodied in the life and character of its Founder and set forth as an inspirational ideal, for the Christian.

4. It is, when personally embraced, an inward experience for the individual of a renewal of spirit as to motive and practice, with the consequent effects on the moral sensibilities and emotions. It is, therefore, regeneration.

5. It is, again, in its operative energy, a moral force. Appealing to the moral sense it awakens conscience, and thus becomes a governing factor in human conduct by introducing powerful motives to right action. "The kingdom of God is in power." Hence, Christianity is power.

From these considerations it will appear that we are not to use the term "Christianity" as implying something that has evolved out of nature, or as a material and tangible thing governed by material laws. But, in whatever phase we regard it, we should consider the question of its origin. Is it something born or made? Did it evolve, or was it a new creation? Was it a new variety—the outgrowth of some kind of hybridism—or the result of a change of environment? Or was it an

"original type?" The fact that as a system it is a part of an evolving or progressive plan does not place it in the field of scientific evolution, whose laws are "natural selection" and change of environment. A little reflection will, therefore, we think, convince any competent thinker that, on the accepted theory of its divine origin in the advent of the eternal Logos, or Word "made flesh," Christianity was not "an evolution," but a new creation.

It was original in all its essentials. While other systems foreshadowed it and prepared the way for it, none of them grasped its true significance or its central thought, salvation by faith in the righteousness of another, and that other a divine Redeemer. This idea was proclaimed by the eternal Word, who was, according to Scripture, God "manifest in the flesh." Previous systems had built a structure under the direction of a master Architect, but for what, they knew not. Like Solomon's temple that went up without the sound of tool or hammer—not a work of chance, but the realization of a skillfully prepared plan—these old systems were blindly working out a carefully devised scheme in which Christianity was emphatically the stone which the "builders rejected." But, as in Solomon's temple, the whole structure was prepared from the beginning. The stone which the builders rejected did not find its place at last by "evolution." It was specially prepared for the place long before it reached it. The old systems were practically dead when Christianity came into existence. There was no shading of species into this new system; its appearance was sudden and phenomenal. As Athena sprang full-grown from the head of Zeus, so Christianity sprang suddenly into being, full-fledged and full-armed. It was like a blazing comet, shot suddenly from the darkness of chaos into the glory of the Pentecostal morning. To apply the principles of scientific evolution to the advent of Christianity is stupendous folly.

It may be argued at this point that, inasmuch as the preceding systems foreshadowed it, Christianity is therefore evolved from them. But a model does not evolve a ship or a machine; neither does a type evolve the antitype in religion, but rather the antitype gives rise to the type. As the

ship itself is planned in the mind of the architect before the model or type can be made, so the Christian system was planned before the model or type could exist. To argue that the divine plan was gradually evolved by selection or environment because it was foreshadowed in previous systems is fallacious; the types and shadows of the Mosaic dispensation, in particular, did not evolve, but were given like the antitype by direct and special divine revelation.

And just here we may remark that one of the most stupendous blunders of modern scientists has been the confounding of development with evolution. Both materialistic and theistic advocates of evolution have been guilty of the same error. Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Romanes, Drummond, and Kidd have all fallen into the same snare. We cannot discuss this point at length, but it seems necessary to call attention to the confusion of these two distinct phases of progress which has been made. When Drummond, Kidd, and others point to the case of the Sandwich Islanders or the aborigines of Australia in their progress from barbarism to civilization as an illustration of the evolution of civilized man out of a primeval savage they egregiously blunder in their failure to distinguish between development and evolution. These cases were not cases of evolution at all, but of simple development, and therefore prove nothing for scientific evolution. What, then, is the difference between the two? While in many instances the terms are synonymous and may be used interchangeably, yet in the strictly scientific sense they cannot be so used without leading to confusion. The term "evolution" in its scientific sense implies the process by which structural changes are produced in the organisms of plants and animals, through a long succession of generations and series of changes in environment; and these morphological changes mark the varieties of species that are thus produced from a single original type. Now this theory of evolution, if correct, calls for certain indispensable elements in order to its success. It must have not only a changing environment and principle of selection, producing or tending to adaptation of organism to environment, but it must also have an indefinite period of time, and a long series of generations in order to bring about these changes which

only come slowly and gradually. Evolution knows no short cuts "across lots," no sudden leaps over chasms. All who come along her way must come by the beaten path and follow her ancient trails.

Let us examine for a moment the cases so often referred to by evolutionists in support of their theories and see wherein they have erred. As an illustration, the aborigines of Australia are often cited to show that man could have evolved from a savage to a highly civilized and intelligent being. But, in trying to prove their position on presumptive evidence, the evolutionists have proved too much. They have shown that the children of these lowest known specimens of savagery, when taken out of the environment in which they were born and placed in the schools of the Anglo-Saxon beside the children of the most advanced race on the face of the earth, will not only hold their own in learning, but will often surpass their white cousins. And, further, in the case of the Sandwich Islanders, it is shown that they have in the present century advanced from the lowest condition of cannibalism to that of an intelligent and civilized, yea even Christian, people. But, the question is whether either of these cases proves anything whatever for the theory of scientific evolution. Each rather proves that scientists are often short-sighted and confuse themselves and others by confounding the meaning of terms which they employ in teaching their theories. Neither of the cases was a case of evolution in the scientific sense, but simply an instance of development. Scientific evolution implies a long succession of generations for the succession of changes by which a species passes from the lower and simpler to the higher and complex forms. Even the most sanguine evolutionists will not claim that these higher forms, either of organic structure or brain power, are evolved from the lower forms in a single generation. To admit this would be to yield the whole argument for evolution, for to practically grant the sudden advent of new species would be a virtual acknowledgment of creative power acting directly in producing new organisms. The question next arises, then, whether the savage in either of the above cases evolved any new faculties or organisms as he advanced in a single generation from barbarism

to civilization. The answer is apparent—no new organism or faculty was evolved in either case. Every faculty and power that the individual possesses as a civilized man he possessed as a savage, only in a latent or inactive form. We presume the ardent advocates of evolution will not claim otherwise. What, then, is the logical and inevitable conclusion regarding these cases? Simply that there was then no evolution here, other than that which takes place in the life of every individual organism, which we call growth or development and which is the product of education.

So much, then, for the mistakes of evolutionists. And it serves to illustrate how theologians are making the same mistake when speaking of Christianity as an "evolution." It did not evolve; when "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," by that divine manifestation Christianity was started, a new type, original and divine. As a system it stands out unique and distinct from all other systems:

1. It is so in its origin, as we have previously remarked. It was not a hybrid, begotten of Judaism and Greek philosophy, but so distinct from either as to be repudiated by both as the opponent of each. It was "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness." It is distinctively Melchisidekian in type, having no natural ancestor or descendant. It forever stands out as God's special message by a special man, himself unlike all others in his birth and mission. "We preach Christ . . . the power of God, and the wisdom of God," said the great apostle of the Gentiles. Christianity is Christ; Christ was not evolved, but sent. Evolution properly applies to that which has an ancestry and may have a progeny. Only in this line of succession can the principle of "selection" work, if it works at all. Christianity started an original type, and was either the result of supernatural interposition or it is nothing. It was a torchlight swung out of the windows of heaven, glimmering through the darkness, "and the darkness comprehended it not." Neither Judaism nor Greek philosophy recognized any resemblance or relationship in it. Both alike despised and rejected it.

2. It is peculiar in the purpose sought, the restoration of man to the favor of God through and by regeneration, a new

life principle within. And this new life is not evolved out of anything that has gone before, but comes to each individual directly from the divine Father. "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." It is not bequeathed by heredity, but must come to each individual severally, and is the result of a voluntary and personal seeking. It is "Christ in you the hope of glory;" and Christ comes to the individual heart only by individual request. Christianity, then, is never transmitted from one generation to another. It has no existence anywhere else in the world than in individual hearts. "The kingdom of God is within you." There can be no evolution, therefore, for that which is neither hereditary nor transmissible, but which is only received by each individual and that by choice. Herein Christianity stands alone. Other systems have sought chiefly to save men through external means, or through organization. Christianity alone seeks and claims to save men by individual and spiritual regeneration. Individual salvation through repentance, faith, and regeneration—which salvation is applied Christianity—is from the very nature of things repugnant to any theory of salvation by evolution.

3. Christianity is distinct, in that it is the result of a superior and supernatural power acting upon the individual heart in generating this new life within. As the Christ-man was unique in his birth and character, so his Church had its birth in the supernatural bestowment of its chief operating force. The Pentecostal effusion was not an infusion of transmissible fluid that may be passed from one person to another, as Mormonism teaches, but was an individual endowment of non-transmittible force. This force is the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, and is not an inherited quality, but a special bestowment of the divine Father. The governing principle of the Christian life is "The love of God . . . shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." It is not evolved, but "given." How, then, can any thoughtful student of theology and science mistake Christianity for an evolution, when its supernatural power is neither evolved nor transmitted, but is a special gift to the individual soul, and that only on certain stipulated and voluntary conditions? To talk of

it as "an evolution" is the greatest shortsightedness and carelessness, or else it is ignorance of the fundamental principles on which the theory of evolution is built. Its reception is in opposition to all the essential elements of scientific evolution.

4. Christianity is also unique in its methods of operation and growth. That growth is not involuntary, but voluntary. Evolution is, on the contrary, involuntary and unconscious in its methods and progress. Species progress from the lower to higher forms without any concern on their own part, and are even unconscious of any change in progress or in contemplation. According to scientific evolution they are continually progressing, from generation to generation, toward a higher type of organism without even knowing there is any such thing going on in their organisms. They are constantly adjusting themselves to new conditions without scarcely knowing that they have changed conditions. All animal and vegetable growth is carried on in substantially the same way. Neither a man nor a tree grows by trying to grow, as Professor Drummond has pointed out; they simply grow by continuing in the position in which nature has put them, and neither will nor consciousness has anything to do with it. But with Christianity the case is different. Its growth, nay its very existence in the human heart, depends upon these two qualities, consciousness and volition. These are always the two conditions of its benefits with responsible beings.

Where, then, is the evolution in Christianity? It will not do to say that it is in the fact that Christianity is the grand climax in the plan of the infinite Creator and Father; for this grand climax was not "evolved," but was the direct and special work of that infinite Father.



Art. VIII.—THE UNITY OF HISTORY AND RELIGION IN CHRISTIANITY.

The relation of history to religion has not the interest for speculative reason which it had in the preceding century; nevertheless, it is ever a vital question. Whether religion can be conceived of as historical is a question which is no longer current. But, in the present state of the philosophy of religion, a new form of this same question is in vogue—How may religion be historical? At once the purely speculative and polemical form of the question gives place to a view which is vital and constructive. Now the proper method of discussing such a theme is twofold; the general relation of history and religion must be established before there can be deduced the peculiar unity of the two in Christianity.

Twofold as is the nature of the above theme, the method of procedure is not in each case the same. The relation of history and religion is first to be determined in a general and speculative manner. Only when such has been done may this relation be applied to a given historical religion. When the general validity of this relation has been pointed out, then the peculiar value of the same for Christianity may be indicated. Development, as a concept, must be made consistent with religion in general before there can be investigated the position of Christianity in universal history.

That religion is historical is by no means self-evident; nor has such a view been developed without a struggle. The light in which we rejoice to-day once shone in a darkness which comprehended it not. In present-day thought nothing is more apparent than that we are awake to the advantages of history; for among the ideals which the passing century has developed none are more vivid than those of development and process. Hereby is the truth of everything tested, so that reality might be looked upon as that which is capable of development. Both nature and mind reveal this tendency. What has been the influence of Hegel and Darwin in modern thought? A speculative system of becoming and a naturalistic scheme of evolution have dominated the reflections of the

nineteenth century. Thus has the universe of thought and things been set in motion *e pur si muove.* But a mention of these names and these tendencies serves to remind us of what is universally felt.

The spirit of the enlightenment was precisely an opposite of historicity. Then all was static and eternal, and no greater calumny could be brought against an element than to regard it as capable of change. History gave way to nature. That by which this latter conception was developed was reason, according to whose principles history was tried and found wanting. Nature, not in the current sense of an empirical somewhat, but as rationalistic and dogmatic a principle as scholasticism ever saw, was the source and method, the criterion and goal of all. In its application this principle was both practical and speculative. No more significant expounders of this tendency are to be found than Grotius and Spinoza, the one inclining toward ethics, the other toward metaphysics. But, in either case, the historical concept was crowded out by the so-called "natural." Grotius proceeded from the principle of natural rights, *jus naturale;* Spinoza, from that of *natura naturans.* As a result the temporal and contingent were unfavorably compared with the eternal and the necessary. How pale did history then appear, when all was regarded in the light of eternity—*sub specie aeterni.* The magnificent conception of nature became the be-all and end-all of early modern thought.

Natural religion arose under such auspices, and did not fail to become the most typical and exemplary result of such a rationalistic method. Historical religion was at once set at naught; if Christianity had any kernel of truth, it was simply because the former was "as old as the creation." Such was the influence of the method *sub specie aeterni.* It is not difficult to see how historical (mediæval) Christianity might be set at naught. The practical principle of natural rights was elaborated in direct opposition to that of authority; the speculative principle of reason, in defiance of tradition. It was with the clashing of such contradictory opinions that the early periods of modern thought resounded—*jus* versus *autoritas*, *ratio* versus *traditio.* Thus it came about that the facts of positive

religion were dismissed, just as the idea of development was despised. Rejoicing in its emancipation and heedless of history, modern thought did not hesitate to undertake the somewhat arduous task of constructing religion anew. The result was natural religion. If it distrusted the positive and contingent, the enlightenment reassured itself by affirming its faith in nature and reason. For how could the temporal contain the eternal, or contingent facts become necessarily true?

Whatever be the method of history or the principle of historical division in general, the passage from the enlightenment to the present century was no smooth evolution, but was characterized by opposition and negation. This was brought about by skepticism. Doubt was entertained as to the power of reason, as well as of the appropriateness of the idea of nature. Hume and Lessing are representative of this reversal. The latter did not succeed so completely as did Hume in disentangling himself from the artificial enlightenment; nevertheless, in showing the possibilities of a particular form of religion—Judaism-Christianity—as an educator of humanity he performed a service which was wanting in Hume.

The destruction of natural religion and the corresponding rehabilitation of historical religion were brought about by Hume, whose whole philosophy centers round the idea of the positive-historical. Hume's speculative thought turns away from *a priori* reason and logical necessity to the principles of experience. Causation, the very heart of scientific thought, becomes a merely customary connection of ideas. "Custom, then, is the great guide of human life." In ethics the isolated principle of custom becomes more complete and systematic in the form of conduct. Outwardly viewed, ethics (*ethika*) is but the science of custom. Thus did a formal principle receive life. But in religion, which Hume treated historically, the principle of custom became universalized. Custom became the guide of historical life, and here it received its most characteristic treatment. For, it is by virtue of historical process that custom is developed. When history has done its work, then logic and ethics may be elaborated. History thus became the ultimate test of all reality. Reason gave way to custom; nature, to history.

Historicity, according to Hume, was the test of reality. Why was natural religion rejected? Because it was illogical? No; because it was nonhistorical. Natural religion has no history; hence it is false. Examine the history of humanity. We find that the farther back we go toward man's natural state, the farther removed he is from anything like natural religion. Not reason, but superstition characterizes early religion. Natural religion has no place in history; hence it can have no place in reason; it is, accordingly, a fiction of the imagination. History was doubly vindicated; it was delivered from rationalism and triumphed over the fictitious "nature." The test to which history has been submitted was calculated to prove its validity and to bring out its inner nature. Certainly a most serious view of the development of humanity must be entertained when we observe how history has weathered the "storm and stress" of rationalism, just as there must be felt our appreciation of that which has been produced, as it were, through "blood and iron."

Emancipated as history has been by skepticism and positivism, it should be thankful for its escape, yet not content to remain passive in the hands of its deliverers. It is for deliverance from its friends that it should pray; its enemies have disappeared. The now-esteemed method of history may be misapplied. A skeptical positivism may have been of real service in revealing the falsity of rationalism, but the former is by no means the complete form of the philosophy of religion. Thus it comes about that current religious thought is not wholly free from certain dangers inherent in its very method, the historical one. At the same time the experience of the enlightenment should show that the relation of history to religion is by no means an obvious one, so that the unity of the two is not without difficulty. The historical character of religion must be evinced by a deduction from its very nature.

The recoil from an antihistorical rationalism assumes to-day the form of positivism. History is contained in the form of this latter; its inner nature is supposed to be expressed in terms of actuality, or phenomenalism, as well as in the principle of development. Manifesting itself in various philosophical sciences, such a twofold tendency is not absent from

religion, where it appears in the new science of comparative religion, as well as in a revived evangelical theology. In the one there may be observed, in general, the tendency to center all faith in the idea of evolution; and in the other the principle of the positive seems to be dominant. Now, to regard religion from the general standpoint of evolution is bound to be as abstract and valueless as was the practice of rationalism. If the enlightenment reposed its faith in an abstract natural religion developed by reason, current thought tends to look upon the general evolution of religion as the essential and valuable. But, for living religion the abstract natural religion and the empirical evolution of nature-religion are equally alien.* History thus interpreted cannot serve the needs of religion. An abstract evolution of religion is as impotent as an eternal religion of nature. When history is regarded as mere development, such must ever be the result.

In the same way the relation of history to religion cannot be indicated by laying emphasis upon mere matters of historical fact. Advanced evangelical theology is here not without difficulty. Not only does it fail to evince the historical character of religion, but it likewise fails to justify its habit of finding all that is of religious value within the limits of the Christian religion. Such has been the case with the Ritschlian theology; it has not failed to ask the question as to how history relates itself to religion, but it has never given a just answer to the same. With Harnack and Hermann this is strikingly true. In his pamphlet, *Christianity and History*, Harnack finds the value of history for religion to consist in the fact that the former contains an account of the life and influence of a transcendent personality. Hermann is still more pronounced in what may only be regarded as a refined form of positivism. Faith does not repose in a necessary and eternal truth; that would be mysticism. But rather is faith a fact, nothing more. The inner nature of that faith consists in the persuasion that human destiny is not natural but supernatural. As the ground of such belief we have the phenomenon of Jesus Christ. Thus it comes about that the theological tendency

* Comp. De la Saussaye, *Die Vergleichende Religionsforschung und der religiose Glaube* (1898).

presents in current religious thought the counterpart of the scheme of evolutional religion. Together they succeed in exalting an abstract process, as well as isolated facts. Now this is not history, nor does such a method conserve the interests of religion.

Without abandoning the historical position, and at the same time avoiding the error of the enlightenment, present-day religious thought must adjust the question in a different way. Neither rationalism nor positivism will suffice; the one defeats history, the other betrays it. No little light may be thrown upon the question by admitting the difficulty of historical religion; we cannot regard it as of passing interest or as being purely fortuitous. Religion should in some way represent God; and how may this be done if the former be temporal and circumstantial? The historical moment as a whole seems inadequate to reflect the Eternal; much less may a definite and limited period contain the Absolute. Such objections as these are proposed by religion, and history must dispose of them. In such a condition as this gain may result by regarding history not so much as a problem to be solved, but rather as a means of answering another question, that of religion. In all the discussion of the question religion has been looked upon as a complete concept capable of determining the conditions of its historicity. But, when it is seen that religion is itself a problem, history may then find its place as an accompanying principle. The difficulty which religion encounters in realizing itself is obviated by the historical method. History then assumes the form of an assistant, and not that of a burden. Religion can exist and act only as it is historical; in its inner nature it presents problems which history alone can solve.

What, then, is religion? The enlightenment asked this question, but its answer was inadequate. It is not sufficient to refer what is real and vital to abstract reason and a purely negative conception of eternity. To define religion in so many words is a method fraught with little gain; nor may we here discuss the question at any great length. For the purpose of relating history to religion it will suffice to indicate the latter's nature, and that by reference to the soul, the world, and to God. Hereby the inner nature of religion may be

brought out. Religion is not primarily an attempt to gain some speculative view of the world, nor is it a desire to produce practically some result in the world; but is rather the impulse, on the part of the soul, to affirm itself over against the opposition of the world. Thus the end and aim of religion is not a speculative conclusion or an objective result, but consists rather in the self-realization of the soul. Destiny is that which determines the behavior of the soul when its religious consciousness is aroused; the idea of logical deductions and the principle of duty are quite alien to its central spring. The perfect realization of religion occurs when the victory over the world is complete. Christ realizes religion in his own person when he says, "I have overcome the world." Such was the religion of Christ. The good cheer which it imparts follows not as the result of any work he performed or by virtue of any new view of the universe, but is inherent in that religious victory which was his. But this is only a partial and rather negative view of religion.

The task which religion has to accomplish is that of self-realization and world-overcoming. Such is the destiny of the soul. But to work out such a salvation is a task beyond the private powers of the personal soul. The awakening to religious consciousness at once reveals this fact; and, out of the depths of some divine despair, the soul cries out for aid from some more than natural source. Various forms and ages of religion would represent differently this common element of all religious life. Thus, as a second moment in religion enters in the belief in God. Such an idea comes not primarily from the world, for religion is more than scholastic curiosity, but is rather of an inner origin. The idea of God becomes a demand of the soul, when the latter seeks its salvation. While having some general reference to the world, this view of religion involves a twofold principle—the impulse of the soul, in response to the idea of its destiny, and the postulated tendency on the part of a divine soul to further this. Now such a view of religion is not only capable of historical interpretation, but cannot be conceived of apart from historical influence.

With its historical character religion may find a means of

realizing that which otherwise would be impossible. This may be shown from the twofold standpoint involved, and by a method in keeping with actual religion. History provides a method by which the soul can work out its religious destiny, as well as a means by which God can consistently supply his aid. The history of the race makes possible the solution of a problem too great for the individual in his isolated life. To overcome the world is a cumulative effort demanding time indefinite; in it the activity of the soul, as well as the assistance of God, may find room. At the same time the effect of social history upon the individual is not only such as to make possible the working out of his problem, but it likewise serves to develop the character of his problem. Self-affirmation becomes transfigured, and thus receives a more appropriate form than that of egoism. Historical religion thus is influential in assisting the soul in its activity, as well as in setting up the point of departure for its destiny. Accordingly, various stages in the progress of the soul will be indicated by epochs in religious history. The inner connection of the two will be evinced by the inner and outer forms of development.

If nature-religion may be regarded as typical of the original form of man's belief in his supernatural destiny, then the self-affirmation of the soul will be such as to assume the form of ingenuous egoism, this being the result of a nomadic form of social life. But, even here, such an egoism will be tempered by the demands of family and clan. A stage higher, in national religion, the individual soul becomes exalted in the nation, just as the latter by its culture and worship react upon him, enabling him more readily and more consistently to accomplish his task. Universal religion completes the process. The soul in the moment of its complete self-realization is seen; God appears in his absolute and perfect character. Narrow egoism and partial nationalism are done away with. In their stead appears some universal realm of religious life, as the kingdom of God. Such is the climax in the soul's career.

Another view of the same process may at the same time be entertained. Just as the soul has availed itself of various stages and epochs in the history of its realization, so God

may be regarded as a companion idea, developing in a manner consistent and appropriate. Here, again, various stages may be determined. To the patriarch and his clan God appears as a covenant-making Being. With the people of God he assumes the form of a national Jahveh. In universal religion the pure spirituality of God is revealed. In the kingdom of heaven man and God are conceived of as naturally related. Such a kingdom is man's true destiny, just as it is also God's veritable design. In such a realm the soul is realized, while God is revealed. And here is the inner meaning of history. The idea of the kingdom has been wrought out by virtue of an historical method, just as the idea itself is an historical one. As seed sown in the ground, so is the kingdom in the world. Development is inherent in the very notion, and such development makes up the history of religion.

Already, by our mention of the kingdom of God, we have been brought to the very borders of the second and particular part of our theme, the historical form of Christianity. All that has been said concerning the general relation of history and religion is singularly true here. In a double manner has Christianity united these two. It has created the historical form of religion, just as it has also adjusted to faith the content of universal history. Christianity in its most essential nature is preeminently historical. In it we observe the peculiar unity of history and religion. Pre-Christian thought was strikingly nonhistorical; such was the case in both antique and oriental worlds, as will become apparent when we glance at Greece, India, and China. Chinese thought is plainly unhistorical. No progress is made; conservatism rules supreme. If Indian thought has in it the idea of motion and change, such is not with the purpose or result of producing anything vital or essential. All is in motion, an endless becoming, but all is in vain. Change is all for naught; progress leads only to annihilation. In a somewhat different sense does the antique world show itself to be unhistorical. While here there is no particular reverence for the ancient, much less an antipathy to the world, as in the above cases, there is in Greek thought a similar inability to conceive of historical progress. Motion and activity are present, to be sure, but such evince themselves

within a closed circle; nothing new is produced. All reality is given; all that is essential has been accomplished. As a result there prevailed in Greek thought that peace of mind which passed from complacency to resignation, just as oriental thought had been conservative and pessimistic.

Christianity, in striking contrast to such a view, is clearly historical. The historical principle it has created for its own needs. Not as given, but as to be produced, are the real and valuable regarded. History is looked upon as working out a result, and such is regarded as being of the nature of an innovation. The new is wrought out. For the first time did history become valid, just as religion was then placed upon its merits and looked upon as capable of solution. When the essential meaning of religion was seen, the value of history was brought out. Such a unique method has already been observed in the mention of the kingdom of God as a typical idea of Christianity. From a purely formal standpoint this idea of an independent religious realm may find some counterpart in the Buddhist notion of Nirvana, or in the Platonic cosmos of ideas. But, apart from such metaphysical differences as might be pointed out, the great difference in the positive working out of the plan of the kingdom of God consists in the fact that the latter is historical. In the kingdom man realizes himself while God is revealed; but such a use of this idea is made possible only by the historical moment which it contains. That which is realized is by virtue of the historical idea, and such an idea has been achieved by the Christian religion.

The mastery over history which Christianity reveals is still further evinced when we turn from the purely historical idea to the positive content of universal history. Here a remarkable adjustment takes place. Dualism in history is created. The world begins anew; chronology is revised. A glance at the geographical arrangement of this dualism will bring out the radical nature of the latter. The ancient Orient is one thing; the modern Occident another. Europe and America are Christian, and herein consists the striking contrast to the Orient. The oriental world, so far as its significance is concerned, is past and gone; its place has been taken by a new civilization, a new view of the world and of life.

This dualistic view of history which is implied by Christianity becomes more vivid when we pass from purely outer comparisons to the inner meaning of the two parts of human development. The ethical change from Orient to Occident was most radical and striking. It is true that certain phases of advanced Greek thought were more or less indicative of the change which was to follow and that there was a general connection between Judaism and Christianity, but it cannot be denied that the effect of this new movement was catastrophic, just as the position of its founder was cataclysmic. Nietzsche—and did not the possessed in Capernaum confess that Jesus was the Christ?—has paid a strange tribute to the Christianity of Christ by regarding its position in the history of culture as a "transvaluation of all values" ("*Umwerthung aller Werthe*"). As a direct opposition does Christian ethics relate itself to what had formerly been of moral value. Whether such a change be regarded with favor or otherwise, as in Nietzsche's case, it cannot be denied that the inauguration of Christianity was the signal for an ethical upheaval in universal history.

Cataclysmic as is the nature of Christianity, so is the original and unique position of its Founder. And what gain will ensue when theology, assuming the standpoint of religion, measures Christ by means of history? With respect to this original soul all else is a mere before or after; a for or against. In history Christ is creative. Well has St. Paul compared him with Adam. The first Adam desiring to become as God, knowing good and evil, discovered the moral law for himself. Christ, the second and superior Adam, pursued a different method. He thought it not robbery to become equal with God, and thus, according to the mystery of the *kenosis*, he rediscovered the moral law, the will of God. But what may such symbolism mean? The first Adam and his *morale* were both oriental, and are now antiquated; whereas the heavenly Adam finds value in a totally different method of life, and this becomes the ethics of the Occident. Thus does the dualism of universal history bring out the comparison of these two creative personalities.

The general relation of religion to history and the unity of

the two in Christianity lead to a final question—How may a single period in universal history become of intrinsic value for what is so embracing as the relation of the eternal God to humanity? In a new guise rationalism here appears, demanding that we regard history as a smooth and gradual evolution. But such a view, however applicable to the history of nature, does not necessarily hold in the history of culture. In the latter prevails the spirit of freedom, so that history is not naturalized but spiritualized. Various branches of culture reveal this truth. In the history of philosophy all that was essential to ancient and mediæval thought was developed within the chronological limits of the life of Plato. The history of art shows that the secrets of the *Renaissance* were solved in the twinkling of an eye. Slowly ascending through Romanesque and Gothic types, then as regularly descending in Barock and Rococco, the essentials of modern art were all developed upon the narrow ridge spanned by Raphael's life of thirty-seven years. Why, then, may we not find the essentials of occidental religion limited to the life of John the evangelist, who observed the influence of Christ's life and the effect of his death upon men? The guiding principle should be, not a theory of evolution, but a sense of religious value. Philosophy ignores the ages and hastens to Plato. Art centers in Raphael and his contemporaries. Religion thus knows only one name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

Charles Gray Shaw.

Art. IX.—THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

What is the higher criticism? It is not a set of theories or conclusions of any kind; it is a method. When Dr. Briggs defines it to be "the higher task" of considering the scriptural writings "as to integrity, authenticity, literary form, and reliability," he exactly agrees with that most orthodox and conservative scholar, Principal Cave, who asks, "What is the critical method?" and replies, "It is the examination of the books of the Bible by the same principles by which all literature is studied; it is logic; it is the application to the law and the prophets of that inductive method by which discoveries innumerable have been made in all the paths of research." And the principal continues by saying that "it is a rational examination of the facts of the Old Testament, facts of literature, history, style, and content by the aid of comparison and inference." He then declares that the greatest need of this hour is a more scholarly, thorough, and well-balanced application of this scientific method. This is indeed the position of Professor William Henry Green, and of every other orthodox conservative who is at the same time a critical scholar. The writer does not know even one Old Testament man in the world to-day who has a reputation outside his own village that does not, at least professedly, accept the critical method. August Köhler, who took the lead of the conservative evangelical forces of Germany in Old Testament criticism when Delitzsch died, voiced the unanimous opinion of scholarship when he wrote a book, the main contention of which was that wrong criticism was not to be anathematized but answered, and that only criticism could answer criticism. The skeptics who represent the orthodox position as different from this are simply slandering us. That thoroughly orthodox Old Testament scholar, Professor Charles H. H. Wright, wrote recently, "There are those, alas, who look upon every deviation from the old traditional views as akin to apostasy from the faith. But they who are gifted with a firmer faith in the 'oracles of God,' and are indisposed to think the 'ark' in danger because the oxen happen to stumble, will welcome all

new light upon every biblical question." So Dr. Delitzsch even more forcibly says, "The love of truth, submission to the force of truth, the surrender of traditional views which will not stand the test is a sacred duty, an element of the fear of God."

All this proves that evangelical Christianity believes in the sovereignty and lordship of the truth. The truth is the one king of men whose right to rule Christianity cannot question. This is the one king ruling by divine right. God is the highest truth, and a God-given revelation cannot be in conflict with any truth which can be discovered. If we believe the Bible to be a true record of God's revelation to man, we need not fear that any truth will hurt it.*

In this search for truth the Methodists ought to be most fearless and tolerant, for the Methodist system of doctrine has for its center, not any particular intellectual tenet, but the assured facts of Christian experience. Wesley and Whitefield, Adam Clarke and Richard Watson, notwithstanding their wide divergence in doctrine, were all good Methodists because they were one in this fundamental. Whoever retains a vital Christian experience, such as Methodism emphasizes, cannot think very far wrong. We know Jesus Christ has power on earth to forgive sins, which is the best present-day proof of his omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence. If Jesus Christ is a fact, as Christian experience proves him to be, then the New Testament history must be substantially true and the Old Testament prophecies have been proved true.†

* The writer can remember the time when it was counted heresy in his native town for a minister to suggest that God possibly did not make this earth and all that is on it, just as it stands, in seven literal days. We now see, however, that God's method in creation was a little different from what we thought it was when we were boys. And the change of view has not hurt our religious experience or our reverence for the Bible. We see now that whatever method God took in creation must have been the right method. It is exactly the same with the Bible. Whatever has been God's method of revelation, it must be the right method, and we ought to be as glad to find out exactly what his method was in revelation as in creation.

† Jesus Christ is himself the best vindication of prophecy. What particular difference does it make whether we can tell the name of the inspired prophet who wrote Isaiah liii and various Messianic Psalms or not? That they were written centuries before Jesus came no one doubts. That they did voice the hope of those holy men of God in a coming redemption few, even of the most rationalistic critics, deny. Not by some twist of phrase, as if they were sibylline oracles, but in the heart throbs of their deepest meaning the Old Testament prophecies pointed to the coming Conqueror, Sufferer, Saviour. Even Smend himself acknowledges that the foreknowledge of the prophets is a divine mystery and has its source in divine illumina-

Methodism, therefore, has always urged her theological scholars, from the days of Adam Clarke to those of Professor Harman, to investigate every question of history, textual criticism, and canonicity with absolute freedom, even though they should be led to consider some books, such as the Hebrews, to be anonymous, and others, such as Jude and Second Peter, to have no certain claim to be genuinely apostolic writings. Methodism has always believed that no man and no generation can get all the truth which is hidden in this wonderful word. As the author of the nineteenth Psalm suggests, the Bible is as great as nature, and, like nature, it will keep all future generations busy seeking new discoveries. It is not a brave nor a safe thing for any Church to build a wall of fifteenth century or nineteenth century belief in front of a man and say, "Thus far shalt thou think, but no farther." If we believe that the Bible contains a true revelation from God, we need not fear that any truth can hurt it; and if we believe that the Christian thinker who knows Jesus Christ as the Son of God is guided of the Lord and illuminated by the Holy Spirit, we need not fear that any such thinker who retains his vital Christian experience will be so guided by the divine Spirit as to do any real harm to the book which was written by holy men as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*

It is true that at every great epoch in the Church a new view of some great doctrine has been obtained. Every conflict, so far, with heathendom, with popedom, and with modern rationalism has left the Church holding a better and stronger position than at the beginning of the fight. If this is God's battle, and God still lives, that must always be true. We ought to be glad that in the growth of the race and in the developing of the divine plan the new wine is ever bursting the old bottles. Let them burst if they cannot hold God's new truth.

tion. Surely any Church which has a living faith in a living Christ, and which really believes his promise that he will lead his people into all essential truth (John viii, 31, 32; xvi, 13), must be most free and fearless in its examination of every religious question.

* Edwin Williams, in his *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, just published by the Welsh Methodist Book Concern, urges that if the higher critics believe in a true revelation no harm can come to the Church from their speculations. Certainly this must be true if, in addition to this intellectual belief, they also possess a reverent spirit and personal spiritual union with Him who is the truth.

We hope the day will never come when Methodism will be so careful of her worn-out wine skins that she will count them more important than God's new wine.* The best way to make a heresy powerful is to persecute it and act as if the Church were afraid of it. Heresy cannot be stopped by anathemas. It is perhaps Max Müller who in his *Recollections* tells of an English professor who grew so excited in his class room, while denouncing Froude's *Nemesis of Faith*, that he finally threw the book upon the fire and stirred the coals to make it burn, and then, after this visible annihilation of the book, asked of his students triumphantly, "What have I done?" receiving the unexpected reply from one shrewd pupil, "You have stirred the fire, sir!" The earnest seeker after truth ought to be tolerant of speculation, even when it is opposed to his holiest convictions. Christianity can afford to encourage the most critical examinations of its religious books. There is no other religion that can. The Koran claims to have been written by Gabriel, and the writer has never met a Mohammedan who did not think that he had settled the matter forever by simply quoting proof texts from the Koran. The Mohammedan Church does well not to allow any member or teacher to undertake a critical examination of the claims and contents of the Koran. It could not stand such an examination. But the Bible can. Such investigation may change some old beliefs and opinions of Christianity, but it will change them for the better; for God's truth shall remain, though the earth be shaken and the mountains removed into the depths of the sea. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but the truth of the divine word shall never pass away. He who fears the truth is no real friend of the Bible. There may come a new writing of Jewish history, a new statement of the doctrine of inspiration; the old argu-

* It is better to keep a living truth than a dead dogma. The best way to kill a living faith is to shut it up where it has no room to grow. There were Churches, several centuries ago, which came out of the great Reformation possessors of a new and living creed concerning the sovereignty of God and the sinfulness of man. But they put this belief in a holy vault and double locked the door upon it as something too sacred to look at again; and when Wesley tried to break open the tomb and give the dying faith a little fresh air and breathing room, they drove him away and stoned him with stones. And when to-day the Lord of all life stands before that same vault, ready to cry, "Lazarus, come forth," there are still those who cry, "No, Lord."

ment from prophecy based upon fragments and scraps of texts may be rendered impossible; but the Bible as a record of God's revelation to man and his infallible guide from earth to heaven will not be harmed. As Kamphausen says, "The Bible abides; scientific attempts to sketch the history of the Bible come and go." Dr. Briggs himself declares, "The substance of Holy Scripture, the divine teaching as to religious faith and morals, is errorless and infallible," while Robertson Smith once wrote, "Of this I am sure, . . . that the Bible does speak to the heart of man in words that can only come from God—that no historic research can deprive me of this conviction or make less precious the divine utterances that speak straight to the heart." Methodism can be charitable with men like these who hold what we believe to be wrong theories; for history shows that many theories which have been proved erroneous have yet frequently been productive of good results.

God has proved in the past that he can overrule to his glory the phases of criticism just as truly as he does the courses of external history. So much has been said about the work of certain great scholars of the extreme radical school that some may have imagined that rationalism has monopolized the scholarship and won all the victories of this century. Nothing could be more untrue. Two generations ago when Tholuck, who was himself a converted rationalist, went to Halle as a professor he could find only one other professor and five students in the entire university who were evangelical believers, and they were called "the idiotic orthodox." This represented the general feeling in the great German universities at that time. There was an almost unanimous verdict of expert German scholarship, not only against the trustworthiness of the Old Testament documents, but of the New Testament documents as well. There has been a great change in our generation, and even in the last decade. Conservative evangelical scholars now fill the chairs which were occupied by rationalists of the most pronounced type only a short time ago. Who is in Halle now, where Tholuck was insulted and even had his house attacked because of his evangelical opinions? Everyone will think of such men as Bey-

schlag and Haupt and Kählar, three scholars who are as famous for their great learning as for their evangelical spirit and criticism, while Edward Meyer of that university, one of the great historians of the age, who only a few years ago was attacking the historic credibility of the Old Testament, is now defending these narratives on scientific critical grounds. At Leipsic one thinks at once of Delitzsch, who was followed by Buhl and then by Kittel, all great scholars and conservative teachers. At Berlin, when Dillman died, it was Baethgen, a pronounced conservative, who was chosen to succeed him; and it is Baudissin of Marburg, another conservative, who has written a mighty work aimed at the very center of the Wellhausen theory, who has also just been invited to Berlin. It is interesting to remember also that Dr. Adolph Harnack, of that university and one of the chief leaders of the radical school, has recently been driven by the scientific higher-critical method to date the New Testament books surprisingly near the very time when orthodoxy has always claimed they were written. If this radical can say in his *Geschichte*, 1896, "The most severe examination of the historic foundations of the New Testament has only made it the stronger," may we not believe that by this same critical method Old Testament scholarship may in time, through the providence of God, render the Church a similar service?

The present writer does not doubt, considering the present tendency, that the theories which may too often be described as "hairsplitting" and "atom-dividing"—the theories which would turn all Jewish history upside down, and would move almost all its literature into post-exilic time and make all the great Hebrew classics a patchwork tacked together by unknown men, often from very questionable motives—will in the lifetime of men now living have been thrown into the curiosity shop of scholarship, while the documents of the Old Testament, like those of the New, will have taken their place as the most authoritative and critically accurate documents relating to the history and belief of Israel. That the Gaussen theory of inspiration and the Milman method of writing Jewish history will ever return cannot be believed by anyone who knows how the new method has illuminated the life and

thought of this ancient people. Already the higher-critical method has done much to increase men's love for the Bible. And as critical scholars continue to use it, without being handicapped with presuppositions against the miraculous and the truly prophetic and supernatural character of these records, better results will certainly be obtained. The writer has little sympathy for the thing called on the street "higher criticism"—a thing which has well been called a learning "infatuated with a sense of its own infallibility, void of reverence, and spectacled with foregone conclusions." But even this is not as bad as an ignorance equally infatuated with a sense of its own infallibility and equally spectacled with foregone conclusions, which would call all criticism heretical that is not cast in its own narrow, pre-scientific mold and that does not therefore reach fifteenth century or eighteenth century conclusions.



Art. X.—BROWNING'S VISION OF OLD AGE.

Our nineteenth century poets have sounded no more helpful note than Browning's clear trumpet peal of optimism. In a time of spiritual depression and of morbid fears, a time of waning faith in the individual human destiny as against the general averages of political science and the deterministic and rationalistic explanations of man's life, in such a time he declared

> This life's no blot or blank,
> It means intensely and it means good;
> To find its meaning is my meat and drink.

Its every phase as connected with individual destiny was studied, and its good was proved. His poetry culminates in a ringing confidence in the possibilities of life even through its latest years to the brink of the grave. He, "the young and undefeated," looks steadily to that "last of life, for which the first was made."

To what extent is his thought about old age a new perception for the race, a "point of the eternal power hid yestereve?" The venerable white hairs of Nestor in the Greek councils, the pious care of Anchises' son, were long known to the ancients; Hrothgar, the grand old man of our Saxon forefathers, and Lear, broken in mind and body, but filled with pitiable yearning for love, speak to us from the past. Yet, in spite of this, the thought of age was usually a threat, not a promise. The Renaissance, with its mundane joys, saw almost with horror that "old men have gray beard, their faces wrinkled, their eyes purging thick amber and plum-tree gum, and that they have a plentiful lack of wit, together with most weak hams." The thought of a loathsome debility conquered the conquering spirit of man. Queen Elizabeth fought time with rouge and wigs and bright colors, and would have counted it all but high treason for a subject to have noticed in her the signs of age. In the irreverent time of Anne, gray hairs were satirized and despised by the wits of the day; only Addison pleaded for them in the character of Sir Roger de Coverley. But in Wordsworth, there

broke forth again the perennial fountains of reverence and pity which had produced the "good old Lord Gonzago" and the faithful servant Adam. Michael, the leech gatherer, the pastor in the "Excursion," all tell of the wisdom and strength of old age. But the deeply personal sonnet to his wife, as he realized that age had come on them together, has a better note:

> Morn into noon did pass, noon into eve,
> And the old day was welcome as the young,
> As welcome and as beautiful,—in sooth
> More beautiful as being a thing more holy.

And this is reechoed by Browning with an equal personal fervor when he speaks of "the age so blessed that by its side youth seems the waste instead." But one further utterance from the "Excursion" should be cited here, a passage which anticipates in part the teaching of Browning:

> Do not think
> That good and wise ever will be allowed,
> Though strength decay, to breathe in such a state
> As shall divide them wholly from the stir
> Of hopeful nature. Rightly is it said
> That man descends into the vale of years;
> Yet have I thought that we might also speak,
> And not presumptuously, I trust, of age
> As of a final eminence; though bare
> In aspect and forbidding, yet a point
> On which 'tis not impossible to sit
> In awful sovereignty; a place of power,
> A throne, that may be likened unto his
> Who in some placid day of summer, looks
> Down from a mountain top. . . .
>
> For on that superior height,
> Who sits is disencumbered from the press
> Of mere obstructions, and is privileged
> To breathe in solitude, above the host
> Of ever-humming insects, mid thin air
> That suits not them . . .
> And may it not be hoped, that, placed by age
> In like removal, tranquil though severe,
> We are not so removed for utter loss,
> But for some favor, suited to our need?
> What more than that the severing should confer
> Fresh power to commune with the invisible world

> And hear the mighty stream of tendency
> Uttering, for the elevation of our thoughts,
> A clear, sonorous voice, inaudible
> To the vast multitude.

Browning is the chief heir to this utterance. Other nineteenth century writers have dwelt on the kindliness or the pity-moving weakness of age. The latter does not touch Browning's art, the former affects it but slightly. These are superseded by the larger perception of the power and majesty and sweeping vision of age, "its final eminence" of "awful sovereignty." Age is no longer trembling but triumphant. It is the very crown of life; for, "say what fools will, it is, or should be, the best of life—its fruit, all tends to, stem and leaf and flower." It is the time of fruitage, when life's whole results, self-involved, have reached maturity. Nor is it deficient in joy:

> By the spirit, when age shall o'ercome thee, thou still shalt enjoy
> More indeed, than at first, when inconscious, the life of a boy.

There is no half-hearted shrinking from infirmity; but the full glory of Browning's faith in humanity gathers as a halo around the brow of age. He has created a triad of aged heroes, not Nestors of counsel, nor Lears of suffering, but athletes of God, meeting spiritual enemies and overcoming them. They grapple with every assailing doubt against the faith in man and God. They are the nineteenth century counterparts of Milton's Samson. The wisdom of experience, the sinew of training, and the fidelity of love are alike theirs. They ask for no help nor pity for themselves; they rather minister to the needy world from their own large resources of spirit; three great ones of earth indeed—the Apostle John, Rabbi Ben Ezra, and Pope Innocent. Browning's portrayal of these three men fell within half a dozen years of his artistic life, between his fifty-first and his fifty-seventh years, years when the memory of his own bitterest sorrow was new. And the artist has made them the mouthpieces of his weightiest message to his generation—a message which came to him then through his own sorrow—his faith in man's life and his trust in God's love. Each of these three have been trained to endure hardness as a good soldier of God. John, in "A Death in the

Desert," had been tested by the Roman spear, by the glozings of Cerinthus, by the rationalism of modern speculators; yet he had learned through successive failures, and rising on his failures he could see that "when pain ends, gain ends too." Rabbi Ben Ezra had felt earth's rebuffs; the truth as he saw it had been disputed by those around him; his whole life had been read amiss; yet he, too, says:

> Be our joys three parts pain,
> Strive and hold cheap the strain:
> Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe.

And the good old Pope, in "The Ring and the Book," weighed down with sorrow at having all his world to condemn, sees that for himself and for all others "life is training and a passage," that "all to the very end is trial in life." And all of the three, having borne the probation of life, stand ready alike to weigh the past and to face the future.

But in these three poems, Browning is concerned, not so much with the process of training man, a common thought of his in looking at individual destinies, but rather with the spiritual power and insight of those who have passed through probation and have been approved. They are rich, not merely in knowledge, but in wisdom. They have steadily tried to find and to realize God in his world. Their aspirations have been crowned by an abiding of Truth in their souls. Life to them has been "just the chance of the prize of winning love." Nor has God left those who aspired to him in darkness. The Rabbi can say, "I, who saw power, see love now, perfect, too." John rests in "the love that tops the might, the Christ in God." And the Pope demands "what lacks then of perfection fit for God but just the instance which this tale supplies, of love without a limit?" They have gained the great central truth, that God is in all his world for good, with his love and with his power; and "the Christ in God" solves all problems in the world and out of it for at least two of them. This Truth "*is*" to them, it has taken up its abode in their inmost natures, where truth may "abide in fullness." Hence they are seers, interpreting life through this vision of Truth. Each stands a valiant fighter against disbelief and discouragement. John sees and answers the

repeated attacks on Christianity even down to the skepticism of the nineteenth century. Rabbi Ben Ezra surveys the whole of life, sees the plan of its years of trouble, its joys of the flesh, its ineffectual yearnings, then his great soul springs heavenward with glad faith in the molding hand of "The Potter," whose plan is full of love. The Pope, after judging the men brought to his bar, with an eye, as it were, the eye of God, turns to the whole "dread machinery of sin and sorrow." He studies the problem of evil. Then he shows man how to "love in turn and be beloved, creative and self-sacrificing too, and thus eventually Godlike." And grieving over the torpor of assurance which has benumbed his age, he looks to the next few years when all assurance will be shaken from man's creed, and when man will again need to devote himself to the endangered truth. Each of them faces the doubts which assail the religious thinkers of our own century; each would help the troubled faith of our age. "Still within life, though lifted o'er its strife," they "discern, compare, pronounce, at last," by the light of the Truth within them.

But Browning understands equally well the sadness of visionless age. He could not shut his eyes to the fact that for each single aspiring soul there were many who were contented to "find and feast and feed," who were not kindled by a "spark of God," who had miserably deafened their ears to the voice of aspiration within them. Browning has portrayed such men in the dying Bishop and in King Victor. But his saddest picture of darkened age is in Cleon. In him we have the pathetic failure of man's best insight when cut off from the revealed truth of God. He represents the ripe product of Greek culture; he has gathered the best of Greece into his own life; but a godless world crushes his spirit. He yearns for another life to round to completion the imperfections of this. And he can only look with a shudder on the time when "the hand shakes, the years increase, the horrow quickens still from year to year, the consummation coming past escape, when I shall know most, yet least enjoy." Such is old age to those who have failed to find God in his universe through their years of probation. Browning sees indeed the horrors of visionless decrepitude, but he also knows the joy, even in

the failing flesh, to the heart that yearns for Truth, and which is assured that he will not drink of it fully until he finds it at last in God. For the body, and the world which environs it, have all along been hiding the Truth:

> Some think creation's meant to show Him forth:
> I say it's meant to hide Him all it can.

Mind "would wither up at once confronted by the truth of Him." And as the Pope adds, "This world is meant to hide Him." To the strong vigorous youth, this life immediately around, this life of joy in the senses, is so insistent and ever present, that he is blinded to the Truth above it. But with the decay of the body the real life of the spirit begins to shine through the tattered veil of flesh. In his "ultimate decrepitude" of eighty-six toilsome years, the Pope is also "sensible of fires that more and more visit a soul in passage to the sky, left nakeder than when flesh robe was new." The apostle John, nearing his hundredth year, remembers the "flesh as a veil of youth and strength, about each spirit," but he also knows that "years . . . wear the thickness thin, and let men see." So of the veil of flesh which had once kept him safe, there is now scarce a shred, and he "lies bare to the universal prick of light"—the light of God's Truth. What was physical decrepitude to these men but the breaking of the clouds as their souls rose at last to God!

Such is Robert Browning's declaration as to the vision of age. He saw this in middle life, he realized it in full till well on toward fourscore. And in his last poem he put the seal of experience to what had once been only the gleam of prophecy.

Chas. D. Hodell

Art. XI.—THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE RETRIBUTION.

The tendency of religious thought to-day is clearly in the direction of a restatement of the doctrine of divine retribution. Let no one be alarmed at this. In an important sense theology is a progressive science. Men cannot state truth perfectly unless they see it perfectly. Increase of knowledge and refinement of spirit must help the vision of man in matters of such vast moment as are involved in the character of God and the laws by which he governs the moral universe. It is true that the Scriptures are, and in spite of all that can be done to the contrary, will be, our only and sufficient rule of faith and practice. But it takes culture and knowledge properly to interpret the facts and figures of the Bible. Like nature, we can easily find out from it all that is necessary for practical purposes, but, like nature, it is easy to form incorrect ideas from it through our ignorance. It is certain that no thoughtful Christian now believes in the literalness of the Bible teaching concerning the doom of wicked men, nor yet in the forms this doctrine assumed one hundred years ago.

But a question here arises, Whither are we drifting? What will be the thought of the Church on this subject when it settles into a form that shall satisfy the judgment of an enlightened world? There is need of more attention to this matter. The motive of fear is just as necessary in the economy of nature as is that of love. The influence of fear was potent in the preaching of early Methodism. It is by no means certain that the pulpit has not lost in power by refusing to longer state the old formulas of eschatological teaching, while nothing definite has taken its place. Certainly it is high time that more thought was awakened on this subject. This paper is written with the hope that it may contribute a little to that end.

I. The doctrine of divine retribution will never be permanently formulated on the basis of Universalism. This is unscriptural, because there the doom of the sinner is no more limited, as to time, than is the reward of the righteous. It

is, moreover, unreasonable. If God could save a soul in the other world in spite of his own choice, he could certainly do it in this. May we not as confidently say that if he could, he would, not only for the glory of his name, but much more because of his love for the sinner? If he does not do it here, who dares to say he will do it in the next world? To say that men will be more willing to be saved in the next world than in this, is to beg the question. Sin can scarcely produce greater horrors than may be seen as a direct consequence of it in this life. If this can go without arresting the downward way of men, how can we say it will do it in the world to come? Virtue appears in this world in very attractive form. Her beauty is seen in nature, and it has been glorified by art. What could be said that has not been said in its praise? But if all this can be lavished without avail on the sinner, who shall say that anything can reach him in the world to come? The fact that every year lessens the probability of a sinner turning from his evil ways, from boyhood to old age, points with unmistakable certainty to the time when our doom, or our deserts, will be settled by the awful words, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Finally, Universalism fails in the true test by which we may always know the divine teaching. The test given by our Lord as a way of avoiding false prophets, or false teachers, is this: "By their fruits ye shall know them." The fruits of Universalism have never been found in the increase of spiritual life and growth. Morality does persist in its advocates frequently, in spite of their faith, but is rarely, if ever, promoted by it. Much less is the spirit of piety promoted by its teachings.

The doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked seems to be more productive of piety than Universalism. Yet it is seriously defective in that also, since wicked men indulge largely in the thought that "death ends all" as a means to comfort when thinking of the possible consequences of their transgressions. The thought that God would raise the wicked into physical life again, merely to burn them up in his anger, is not only derogatory to the New Testament conception of

Deity, but would be found of little avail in restraining the sinner, even if he could be induced to believe it. But the doctrine of annihilation seems to be associated with that of a crude materialism. The immortality of the soul is stoutly denied by most, if not all, who teach this doctrine. But once for all, if the soul is not immortal, there is no consistent belief in the immortality of the righteous.

It is needless to spend time in the discussion of the doctrine of a second probation. It is a scheme of Universalism, and must fall with their faith. There is not a word of Scripture in favor of it, and those who have held to it among evangelical Christians have done so with a hesitation of manner, and an uncertainty of spirit, which proclaimed too manifestly the want of a reasonable basis for an "eternal hope."

We may therefore conclude that without a new revelation we shall continue to hold with the Church in all ages, that a soul may be lost, and that the consciousness of that loss shall eternally go with it. We do not say that no difficulties go with such a belief. Difficulties meet us on every hand when we try to examine the conditions of the life to come, with only the present life by which to judge, or only the light we now have by which to make our investigation. But religion is not the only thing that involves difficulties for the human mind to grapple with. Our highest wisdom will be found in discovering what best meets the demands of the present life in reference to the future, and holding on to that in spite of difficulties. And this, too, we ought to preach, not with clenched fist and frowning brow, as though we had been appointed judge of all men, but lovingly, tenderly, with the most careful solicitude for the eternal welfare of those who hear us.

II. Let us now consider what modifications in our former ways of teaching this subject the enlarged thought of the age requires.

(*a*) It is necessary that we should conceive of divine retribution as in no sense an expression of divine vindictiveness. That passages in the Old Testament naturally bear such a meaning is readily conceded. But we must remember that revelation, in some measure at least, had to conform to the

habits of thought of the times in which it was written. Men wrote it, and there is a human element in what they wrote. We shall never interpret the Bible correctly until we give due weight to that fact. The correct conception can only be gained when we get into the spirit of the truth, rather than when we are solely guided by its verbal formulas. From the New Testament, if properly considered, all ideas of a revengeful, vindictive, retaliating Deity are forever eliminated. Here we become acquainted with God in the person of Jesus Christ. He said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Anything like human vindictiveness is an impossibility with Him who prayed, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." The thought that divine retribution was an expression merely of the power and glory of God, a manifestation of his complete triumph over his enemies, has been a leaven in theology which has wrought an incalculable amount of evil. It has been made the basis of untold horrors of torture and suffering, while men were helping to vindicate the glory of God. Such thoughts are unworthy of a noble manhood; how infinitely belittling to the divine character. And here it may be well to notice how the spirit of Christ has come to influence the comminatory ideas of nations. To grind a conquered people in the dust, to inflict the worst possible punishment on political offenders, was once the common experience of the world. The close of our civil war was a revelation as to the transformation the Gospel has made on human thought and action. This work will go on. In spite of war and bloodshed we are moving out on a millennium of human kindness. Christianity is doing this, and it is destined to complete the work, though the demon of hate may yet produce some final convulsions before he is entirely cast out. The perfection of God's truth is well seen on this subject, when we contemplate Jesus, rejected, plotted against, already facing a horrible death from the rulers and people of Jerusalem, sitting on the Mount of Olives, and weeping over the ills that were so soon to be visited on that wicked city: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would

not!" Still God is swearing by himself, because he can swear by no greater: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"

(*b*) Near akin to the preceding thought is another which we should carefully ponder. The perdition of ungodly men is not a place or condition especially fitted up by divine skill for the purpose of making them wretched. The conception of mediæval theology was that divine skill had exhausted itself to make guilty souls miserable in the extreme. This is a horrible thought to any man of right sentiments. It has made a multitude of infidels. It is making them yet. The retribution the sinner feels is the direct result of violated law. There is a right way and there is a wrong way. Infinite skill could not make the same results to follow both. The sinner has started on a course where happiness can never be found, but where wretchedness will be in exact proportion to the distance he goes. Instead of believing that God would make it as hard as possible for the sinner, we may conclude with good reason that he will do exactly the reverse. So it is in this life. His care is over the bad as well as the good. On both he sends the sunshine and the shower. To each the pestilence comes with equal severity. The difference is in the character. We may carry hell or heaven in our own bosoms, according as we choose. We may see the smile of God, and it may become the sunshine of our souls. Then we share the part of those whom the poet has described:

> The day glides sweetly o'er their heads,
> Made up of innocence and love;
> And soft and silent as the shades,
> Their nightly minutes gently move.
>
> Quick as their thoughts their joys come on,
> But fly not half so swift away:
> Their souls are ever bright as noon,
> And calm as summer evenings be.

But suppose we turn from God and walk in our own shadow, how absurd to suppose that the fruition of righteousness should be ours. And if we walk in darkness forever, whose fault is it?

The eternal law of right and wrong could not make it otherwise than miserable.

(*c*) Any proper conception of divine retribution must include that which is lost by sin though the sinner should be saved. This is a subject far too much neglected. Unfortunately the pulpit is not only too silent about it, but the opposite teaching is most carelessly given in too many instances. An evangelist said to his congregation, "If you are forgiven, and received into the family of heaven, it will be to you as though you had never sinned." This is only a very little better than the old theory, actually believed by some, that the more the believer sins the more he will magnify the grace of God, and the brighter he will make heaven for his soul. See where this logic leads us. Here is a man who early learned the life of faith in the Son of God. From childhood he led a useful life; all the strength of his manhood was given to promote the glory of God and the good of humanity. In the same school, possibly in the same family, one lived whose abilities were fully equal to the good man; but he early went astray, fell into bad habits, led others into vice, sinned on, until hardly an element of manhood was to be found in him; then, in old age, repented, sought and obtained the forgiveness of God. Will these two stand on equal terms of heavenly bliss? Will he stand as high in glory, be as happy and blessed as the one that gave a whole life to virtue and godliness? To ask such questions is to answer them. Right must change places with wrong before such results could be indorsed by the Judge of all men. Sin is a waste, sin is a loss, sin is a destruction. It is a missing the mark. Every day a man continues in sin he loses something from the sum total of his possible success. Though he may repent, though he may be forgiven, though his heart may be cleansed from all unrighteousness, yet opportunities squandered cannot be restored, and the loss from his folly must be great in time and eternity.

But some one may say, How about the atonement? Christian theology will never part with the doctrine of the atonement, but some theories of it we cannot too soon set aside. We cannot too soon part company with the notion that the atonement answers in God's sight, not only for the death

of the sinner, but for his righteousness as well. The most we can say is, that the sufferings of the garden and the cross present two important facts to the sinner: First, that God loves him, and has made a great sacrifice for him; second, that God hates sin, and cannot suffer it to be taken from the natural consequences which law has affixed to it without such compensation made to law as will leave it honorable and effective forever. But what has this to do with the conclusions reached above? Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. The law cannot pass away, nor be nullified by grace. The Gospel comes in with hope for the man who has gone wrong. It tells him that though much has already been lost, there is something left that grace will secure to him. "By the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," he may yet have eternal life.

(*d*) The central thought of all correct ideas of divine retribution is death. This is scriptural, and, in the highest sense of the word, it is reasonable. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." This is not physical death, which is natural, and an essential factor in all material existence. It is spiritual death. This does not mean annihilation. Death never means that. The body of the old Egyptian king is dead, but it exists, and has existed for thousands of years. It may exist a million more. The essential fact of physical death is, that it deprives the body of its power to adjust itself to its environment. The body has eyes, but it no longer sees; it has ears, but it no longer hears; the nerves are all in place, but they no longer feel. The body is not conscious, for consciousness is not an attribute of matter. But consciousness is an attribute of spirit, hence dead spirits are conscious. But our description of death—want of ability to adjust itself to environment—holds as good here as in physical death. Perhaps a good definition of spiritual death is maladjustment to environment. It does not see what it ought to see. It cannot see God. It cannot see his goodness. Much more it is incapable of feeling his goodness, or even in believing in it. Who knows but that atheism may exist in the other world as well as in this? Indeed, what else could be expected of "wondering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever?" This also would involve the impos-

sibility of enjoying what God has intended for the soul in its purity. Such would naturally call evil good, and good would be counted evil. So it is in this world. A man conscious of his acceptance with God has a heaven in his own soul. To him the earth becomes a land of Beulah, while the man who has cut off his relation to God, severed the vital cord that brought life and light into his soul, becomes a pessimist, boasts of his ability to make a better world than this. He becomes out of sympathy with everything divine, and finds only the torment of discord in every harmony God has made. Such a one may find momentary gratification in earthly, animal appetites, but when these fail, what can he find to give pleasure in this life? What can he hope for as a source of happiness in the world to come?

Now spiritual death means eternal death unless there is a resurrection. Even physical death means the same unless there is a resurrection. Lazarus had remained entombed forever except for the voice of Jesus, crying, "Lazarus, come forth!" Once spiritual death has fastened on the soul there is no more life unless we hear the voice of Jesus calling us again to live. It is only by him that we can be raised "from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness." We have not one word of assurance that his power in this work can ever be exercised outside the sphere where he came to use it. Surely there ought to be judgment enough left in every man, even though blinded by sin, to cause him to turn back from a doom like that. But if he see it not, the Holy Spirit is given to show him this very thing. And the offices of that Spirit will be given to all that truly seek them.

C. V. Anthony

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

A book of extraordinary interest, just issued by our Book Concern, in two volumes, octavo, is *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, by Professor R. W. Rogers, of Drew Theological Seminary. A full notice will appear in our pages in due time.

Few incidents illustrate how accessible from the first is the human spirit to the infinite Father of spirits, better than the following story told by a strong man:

When a little boy in petticoats, in my fourth year, one fine day in spring my father led me by the hand to a distant part of the farm, but soon sent me home alone. On the way I had to pass a little "pond-hole" then spreading its waters wide; a rhodora in full bloom attracted my attention and drew me to the spot. At the root of the flaming shrub I saw a little spotted tortoise sunning himself in the shallow water. I lifted the stick I had in my hand to strike the harmless creature; for, though I had never killed any living thing, I had seen other boys out of sport destroy birds, squirrels, and the like, and I felt a disposition to follow their example. But all at once something checked my arm, and a voice within me said, clear and loud, "It is wrong!" I held my uplifted stick in wonder at the new emotion—the consciousness of an involuntary but inward restraint upon my actions—till the tortoise and the rhodora both vanished from my sight. I hastened home and told the tale to my mother, and asked what it was that told me it was wrong. She wiped a tear from her eye with her apron, and taking me up in her arms, said: "Some men call it conscience, but I prefer to call it the voice of God in the soul of man. If you listen and obey it, then it will speak clearer and clearer, and always guide you right; but if you turn a deaf ear or disobey, then it will fade out little by little, and leave you all in the dark without a guide. Your life depends on heeding this Voice." Then she went her way about her affairs, but no event of my life made a more deep and lasting impression on me.

Always, and through every phase of action and of thought, religion was to Gladstone's life what the Nile is to Egypt, what sunshine is to the world. It was especially manifest at his Hawarden home, where the family life was very simple and somewhat old-fashioned—good plain food, regular and early hours, Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone going to church every morning of the week at eight, and breakfasting on their return. With all the business and burdens of his life, he never omitted attending service twice every Sunday, and always held what he called "once-ers" in small repute. He was an appreciative

listener, and his criticism of sermons was very modest. "A notable sermon," he would say; or "A remarkable reference that he made to Isaiah," and so on. His private secretary remembers only one adverse criticism from him, and that was on coming away from a beautiful and brilliant sermon by Mr. White in the Chapel Royal, when Mr. Gladstone said, "He has excited my brain by his quotations, and given me anything but the rest which is what I want and expect to find in church." He did not like to have his brain excited or taxed on Sunday. He wished to be lulled and soothed. A devout Episcopalian, Mr. Gladstone endeavored to exercise a positively religious influence over his associates. Once, at a dinner, Abraham Hayward shocked the company by his views as to a future state. Gladstone, being grieved and troubled, took time the next day from busy cares of state to write Hayward a letter of twelve pages of expostulation and entreaty about his unworthy and unwarranted views; and he had the reward of receiving the message years afterward from Hayward's deathbed, "Tell Mr. Gladstone I do not die an unbeliever."

In her account of the Greek Christian poets who lived and wrote between the second century and the fourteenth, Elizabeth Barrett (Browning) pays the following rapt but right tribute to a language so highly perfected and so vital that to speak of it as a dead language seems even now an irreverent misnomer on the lips of men who still possess the immortal masterpieces of its mighty literature:

> The Greek language was a strong intellectual life, stronger than any similar one which has lived in the breath of "articulately speaking men" and survived it. No other language has lived so long and died so hard, pang by pang, each with a dolphin color—yielding reluctantly to that doom of death and silence which must come at last to the speaker and the speech. Wonderful it is to look back down the great past, thousands of years away—where many generations lie moldered into dust, where the sounding of their trumpets, and the rushing of their scythed chariots, and that great shout which brought down the birds stone-dead from beside the sun, are more silent than the dog breathing at our feet or the fly's paces on our window pane; and yet from the heart of that silence, to feel words rise up, words audible and distinct even to our times. It is wonderful to look back and listen.
>
> Blind Homer spoke this Greek after blind Demodocus, with a quenchless light about his brows, which he felt through his blindness. Pindar rolled his chariots in it, prolonging the clamor of the games. Sappho's heart beat through it, and heaved up the world's. Æschylus strained it to the stature of his high thoughts.

Plato crowned it with his divine peradventures. Aristophanes made it drunk with the wine of his fantastic merriment. The later Platonists wove their souls away in it, out of sight of other souls. The first Christians heard in it God's new revelation, and confessed their Christ in it from the suppliant's knee and presently from the bishop's throne. To all times, and their transitions, the language lent itself through a long summer of above two thousand years. At the close of that long summer Greece lay withered to her root, her academic groves and philosophic gardens all leafless and bare, yet from the depths of her desolation still sounded the voice which did not grow hoarse, but sang on not unsweetly though more faintly than before. Strangely vital was this marvelous language of the Greeks. It seemed as if mankind could not consent to part with it.

SIMPLICITY AND DIGNITY.

A CORRESPONDENT notes that our soldiers dying in battle in Luzon use none of the expressions attributed to an earlier generation, such as, "I die for my country," "Wrap the flag about my body," and other similar utterances once used with a sincerity and naturalness we can hardly appreciate. The note may be worth more than passing attention.

In this century we have altered many things, but no change is more marked or more subtle than the changes in dress, manners, and language. The old-time sayings referred to by the correspondent would, if used now, sound to us like mock heroics, boastful and insincere. The modern soldier could not employ them; we believe such language was very rare in our civil war; we must go farther back to find it in full use. This is due to the fact that the general tendency of progress has been toward simplicity, and sincerity now demands the simpler language. Soldiers are neither better nor worse for the change. The silence of to-day is as patriotic and heroic as the eloquent expressiveness of former times.

The newer way is noticeable also in dress, in rhetorical address, in social intercourse, and in the general temper of society. We are, as a rule, more frank, more direct, less given to profuse expression, less formal and ceremonious in many things. The stately life and the elaborate rhetoric of Washington's time went out with knee buckles and lace-trimmed uniforms in civil life. We certainly can hardly understand the stress laid on the sanctity of the Roman toga or the enthusiasm of grown men about clothes a hundred years ago. If we thanked each other for small kindnesses, or addressed our friends, in the stately fashion of our great-grandfathers' times, we should feel that we were

guilty of stilted affectation and disgraceful insincerity, and would despise ourselves accordingly.

Some affirm that we are more manly than the fathers; they say that the old disposition is manifest among us now in the passion for creating numerous new orders with gaudy uniforms, but that the essential vulgarity of it is indicated by the fact that only second-rate manhood serves in or inclines to join these much-dressed orders. These unduly acidulated criticisms probably miss the point. The change toward informality which we are noting may be at its extreme swing, and the uniformed orders may be the return movement toward more formal and elaborate habits. The extreme of simplicity may have been reached and a movement in the opposite direction may have already begun. At first most railroad men resented the order to wear uniforms, but it is said that the tendency is toward regarding the uniform as an honorable badge. Society journals report an increase in the number of men who, in their own homes, like the presidents in the White House, dine in evening dress, as the gentlemen of the olden times used to put on special and ornamented costumes and make domestic and social occasions stately. Some point to signs of a reaction in manners and even in rhetorical address. Such a reaction need not be feared and might be not without its benefits, for the world is in no danger of being carried back to the artificiality of former centuries; and our extremely simplified habits are not without actual evils and possible dangers.

To suppress fine and noble instincts and sentiments from honest and reasonable expression is unwholesome and unfair. Referring again to our Luzon fighters—the dying soldier has some feelings which the custom of his time makes him ashamed to express. He, as much as the patriot heroes of former times, feels that he dies for his country; he, too, loves the flag and proves it with his blood; tender thoughts may be thrilling in him which are denied utterance by the hard, unwritten law of repression. He is schooled to believe that the men of his time expect him to die in silence.

It has been remarked that religious expression has been less modified by the tendency to reserve, to self-repression, to brevity and bareness of speech, and that, for this reason, a suspicion of insincerity, a sense of something akin to shame, attaches to religious testimony in the minds of many persons; and it is

claimed that this accounts for the increasing number of voiceless Christians. But if there is more freedom of utterance in religious assemblies, than elsewhere, there is no cause for shame. Religion has both a right and a duty of utterance. An atmosphere chilled by prejudice against the expression of genuine feeling is more arctic than the dullest, deadest formalism repeating expressions not in-filled with feeling. If, in religion or in society, we are victims of the notion that honest feeling must be choked into silence as not being in good form, then there is good cause to fight for a recovery of natural freedom, to stimulate expressiveness, and to cultivate the gifts of expression, in order that sincere feeling may have adequate and satisfying forms of utterance. Indeed a certain measure of formality—not formalism—is necessary to the vitality and culture of healthy emotional life. Unspoken feeling may sometimes be deeper and stronger than clamorous emotion, but the feeling of which conventionality makes us ashamed to speak has, or will soon have, a diminished vitality, for a dumb life is unnatural to it, since all emotion tends to break over at the lips. Voiceless religious feeling there is in the depths of pious souls; but that is only because speech fails to reach those deeps of the heart; and systematic and habitual denial of utterance to religious sentiments and emotions must chill the warmth it smothers and benumb the sensibilities.

In the matter of manners, too, the prejudice against polite forms of speech and elaborate courtesy result often in undesirable extremes of plainness, bluntness, and uncourteous simplicity. The too free-and-easy unmannerliness of boys and men in streets or shops becomes sometimes so boorish and brutal that it amounts to a return to barbarism. It is a rude conception of manliness which moves a man to express his love with a past-participle curse and a slap on the shoulder; a young bull or a wild boar out of the woods could hardly be more animal-like or less like a manly man. Partly this style of address may be due to the native coarseness of the man, but it is also, in some degree, fostered by the prejudice against the polite manifestation of any tender friendly feeling. It is a despotic law, indeed, which forbids sincere expression, and forces men to make believe that they have no feeling. A lamentable conclusion it is, if our long efforts to attain simple voiced sincerity has carried us over into coarse-voiced insincerity; if, in trying to avoid the hypocrisies which may underlie profuse expressions,

polite forms, and elaborate rhetoric, we have developed a refusal of expressive forms, and a rough informality which is essentially hypocritical and dishonest, inasmuch as our real feelings are concealed and we pretend to a stolidity, stoicalness, and insensibility which we do not possess.

Something may be said, too, in favor of a return to something more of form at social functions and even at the ordinary family dinner. To make the family meal an occasion of refined and orderly proprieties may dignify the home, maintain a school of courtesy, and constitute by the interchange of mutual respect and kindly interest a sort of domestic sacrament. When plain people pride themselves on being rude and unmannerly, or make the family life one careless disorderly informality, they err. Careless and slouchy habits in either parent are demoralizing to the household. To come to the table with clean clothes as well as clean face and hands is hardly an excessive refinement for the father and the children, and wives do not need to be told that the husband is rare who is not favorably affected by her reasonable solicitude for her personal appearance. Too much ceremony, punctiliousness, and costuming there may be in rare instances, hard to find; but people need not dine off the curbstone or live as in a lumber camp in order to prevent themselves from falling into the mistake of coveting rosewood tables and solid silver service. The world may be sweetened and beautified by things which have no moral quality in themselves and yet are potential agencies in its production, as cleanliness is not only akin to godliness, but often immensely promotive of it. Homes need not be gay, frivolous, fashionable, or worldly in gracing their everyday life with orderliness, politeness, and dignity; as its root, the word dignity means only worthiness, fitness, seemliness. Systematic disregard of seemliness, fitness, comeliness, propriety, has unlovely and discreditable effects on customs and manners in the home; and home habits and behaviors are apt to accompany and control us when we go abroad. They were not silly women and careless housewives who, in the old days, put on their best harness when they went to take tea with their sisters.

Our effort to get rid of cant, bombast, hypocrisy, affectation, and other such bad things by forbidding manly feeling to open its mouth, has resulted in unworthy shames, half-developed fineness of feeling, and the suppression of dearest desires. We

are sure that the soldiers dying on those Luzon fields of battle had something to say which they did not utter, and that if the words had been spoken they would have added to the value of their supreme sacrifice; and we must believe, also, that many a child needs words of tenderness and examples of dignity, and that too much inexpressiveness, simplicity, and plainness may be more fatal to sound life than too little.

It is named to us as a reason for hope and congratulation that signs are discovered of an effort to recover lost liberty of utterance, and also tokens of a return toward such a respect for forms and ceremonies as does not render life artificial or pretentious, but rather pays reverence to the voice which bids "all things be done decently and in order." In our tense, hurrying, abrupt practical life there is little danger of profuse expressiveness or excessive and ostentatious ceremoniousness.

A PROTEST AGAINST SACRILEGE.

One of the ablest Democratic journals of the land has recently felt called upon to rebuke certain clergymen for irreverence toward Christ and toward the Bible. Not seeking to pose as a religious teacher, but simply pursuing its functions as public censor and protector of morals, this secular daily declares that, in a Christian community, it is a common duty owed to decency not to compare or class the Son of God with mere men. One occasion of its present complaint is the recently published *Life of Theodore Parker*, in which, the journal says, the biographer has broken loose from that common duty, and is found running at large in the pages of his book in the character of a fugitive from reverence. For this the newspaper sharply reproves him, asserting his offense against moral propriety to be flagrant, his expressions flippant in spirit and deplorable in effect. The following is a part of its criticism:

> The style is marred by startling and unnecessary conjunctions or comparisons of the Saviour of mankind with men and women of this generation. This is a trick of Mr. Chadwick's writing. It is a vice. Instead of being chastised out of it, he seems to revel in it still, and an object which suggests itself as one he has in view appears to be the provocation of readers or critics to just such a protest, and their penetration by just such a shock as here finds expression because of his offense. Mr. Chadwick is a large man. But this practice of his is a very little business. We do not suppose that his purpose is to divinize the Tom, Dick, or Harry among men of whom he speaks or to vulgarize the second Person of the Trinity by his chippy and almost flippant allusions to him.

As an example of the objectionable language which the secular critic censures, this statement is quoted from the biography:

> He [Theodore Parker's father] was, perhaps, a worse farmer for being a pretty good mechanic, and leaving the boys to work the farm while he puttered in the carpenter shop; such an one as that of Nazareth, rude cabinet-making alternating there with the making and mending of farmers' implements. So Theodore had, like the young Jesus, the happy privilege of playing among sweet-smelling chips and shavings.

A similarly censured offense was committed when Parker's biographer, at the funeral of a worthy enough citizen, said concerning the deceased, "Like Jesus Christ and John Brown, he was a son of the common people." Objecting to all such speech, the journal says: "Our protest is against the seeming purpose or policy of vulgarizing God and cheapening Christ, toward both of whom the Bible enjoins reverence, awe, and worship." When one of the "liberal" clergy, whose customary mode of speech is under rebuke, intimates that the rebuker is in bondage to orthodox traditions, and glories in his own "free soul," announcing that he and his brethren will not be admonished into pretending a reverence they do not feel, the Democratic editor replies: "We have no quarrel with this man about 'free souls.' Our soul is as free as his—free to dissent from his smug assumption that only those souls are free at all in whom faith is apparently represented by a fluidity of words and reverence by a vacuum."

The editor rendered a commendable and impressive public service by his weighty, straight-aimed, and trenchant stroke of editorial condemnation. He spoke in defense of communities which make laws and decree punishment against profanity, blasphemy, and perjury; communities which dislike to have their sense of sacred propriety outraged and their morals damaged by the irreverence of public teachers toward holy things, this dislike being due to the same sentiment that protests against a vulgar ruffian's torrent of obscene profanity and punishes perjurers for making light of the binding sacredness of an oath sworn on the Bible before a court.

From the same source recently came another protest against the irreverence sometimes shown toward the Scriptures by ignoring their unique and supreme character of divinely inspired writings, thus lowering their dignity and lessening the estimated authority of their contents. The objection made is against ut-

terances, oral or written, which assert or seem to imply that the men of to-day and their literature are similarly, if not, indeed, equally inspired, and their communications as unquestionable, authoritative, and commanding as those of the biblical writers. Studying the Holy Scriptures just as we study other books, in order to appreciate "the Bible as literature," as the phrase, if not the fad, of our day has it, is not without its dangers, one of which is that we may come to regard, or cause others to regard the Bible as being no more inspired than some, if not many, other books.

When the minister of a famous church spoke of Thoreau as one of three great prophets of God in nature, the other two being Wordsworth and Ruskin, a listening clergyman wrote in comment:

I have no objection to the greatly extended use of the word prophet of these later days, providing the man to whom it is applied has the marks of a prophet. To be a prophet of God a man must possess the sentiment of the Infinite and also must have the power of awakening the sentiment of the Infinite in other men. We cannot read Ruskin's "Mountain Glory" and "Mountain Gloom" without feeling that enchanting awe stealing over us which is always present when the sentiment of the Infinite is awakened in the human soul. We feel that the ground on which we stand is holy ground, and we exclaim, "God is here!"

What is true of Ruskin is even more true of Wordsworth. To him this beautiful world was but the wicket gate which opened into the glory that excelleth. No one can enter into the spirit of Wordsworth's poetry without soon finding himself on the other side of that gate, amid the harmonies and glories of the eternal.

After hearing this sermon I went to work reading and studying Thoreau. But never for a moment did he snatch me away from the things seen and temporal and place me among the things eternal. He is a clear, crisp, and racy writer, a minute observer of nature, with a vein of poetry running through the hard granite of his soul. He has no mark of a prophet of God. He does not speak for God, nor turn the thoughts of men to God.

On the other hand, I look upon Darwin as a prophet of God. Scarcely had his *Origin of Species* been published ere the whole world was talking about God. Darwin has brought out into the light God's method of creation. He has made men to feel that God is immanent in nature, that he is the one ever near.

The preacher failed to discriminate between plain living and beggarly living. To dwell in a shanty costing only twenty-eight dollars to build, to live upon less than four cents a day, to work in the field barefoot, to dress like a tramp, to travel on a pleasure trip to Canada wearing a ten-cent straw hat and an old linen duster, as Thoreau did, is to live like a beggar, and not like a high-toned manly man. It is a great and grave mistake to hold up such manner of living as worthy of imitation. There is nothing more certain than that young men, robust in body and mind, will turn away with loathing from such an example of plain living and high thinking.

Nor is the moral make-up of Thoreau to be commended. He was a cynic. In

his book there is plenty of sarcasm and scorn for humanity, but not a single heart throb of pity or of mercy. In this age, when men are blindly feeling after the great truths of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, surely that man is not one to follow whom genial John Burroughs describes as one "devoid of compassion, devoid of sympathy, devoid of generosity, devoid of patriotism," no matter how devoted such one may be to principle, nor how rich a vein of poetry and of wisdom runs through his books.

Nor can the impartial critic free Thoreau from what Coleridge calls "the devil's darling sin," "the pride that apes humility." Thoreau was proud of his appearance because it was shabby, and of his clothes because they were mean. In his book, *A Yankee in Canada*, he calls attention time and again to the fact that he went to Montreal and Quebec wearing a ten-cent straw hat and a linen duster. As Diogenes was as proud of his tub as Chremylus was of his mansion, as the Quaker is as proud of his gray as the prince is of his purple, so Thoreau was as proud of his poor duds as the Fifth Avenue dude is of his fine clothes.

Upon the pulpit celebrity and his ministerial commentator the editor in chief of a great city journal comments thus:

These clerical gentlemen are very free and easy in their use of the words "prophets of God." The Bible contains the names of all to whom inspiration has given the title of prophet. Men would do well to be equally economical in the use of the title. Such use of it as we complain of does not exalt Ruskin, Wordsworth, or Thoreau to divine authority. Neither does it lower Isaiah, Jeremiah, or Daniel below that plane. It simply suggests that these clergymen and others would better employ words to describe authors whom they like, different from those words which inspiration attaches to men whom God commands us to believe, receive, and obey as his forthputters of revealed truth. The attempt to elevate writers of human limitations to the rank of seers by divine appointment is neither reverent nor accurate.

Such protests as we have quoted are entitled to respect; they have right on their side, reverence in their heart, wisdom in their judgment, and moral majesty in their mien; they will be regarded by all save light-headed fools, reckless rationalists, and incorrigible mountebanks. It is a severe comment on the pulpit when the secular press is constrained to correct and castigate clerical offenders against religious decencies and the cherished sanctities of Christendom. These reproofs from such a source suggest that the entire public, barring only those who are definitely hostile to religion, feels that it has a stake in the dignity, fidelity, sobriety, and integrity of the pulpit. The honorable and worthy portion of a community is more jealous for the credit of the clergy than the pulpit itself sometimes seems to be. It is mortified and grieved when anything is done or said by anybody in religious circles which lessens respect for the Church, the minister, the Bible, or religion. For the sake of

human well-being, all worthy citizens are anxious that the institutions, agencies, and instruments of good shall not cripple themselves or in the least degree impair their influence and capacity for usefulness; for, in truth, all vital interests of the community are affected by, and in large degree dependent on, the purity and power of those agencies. The whole respectable community takes satisfaction in the strength and efficiency of the churches. Every town longs to be proud of its ministers, and is happy when it can be. It rejoices when they are strong and influential, when they are able, studious, and learned, when they are reverent, devout, and spiritually impressive, when they are robust, virile, and intrepid, when they are careful, accurate, judicious, unanswerable, and commanding in their statements, when they are blameless, consistent, pure, and beautiful in life and character. There is hardly a community between the two oceans that will not glory in such ministers. There is one community of some sixty thousand souls, where, for thirty years, the mightiest single force for order and morality has been a certain sturdy, fearless, and austerely faithful Roman Catholic priest, a man whose appearance fits him to impersonate Victor Hugo's Javert. And the population as a whole, nonreligious and Protestant, as well as Catholic, regards that man with admiring and grateful appreciation or with wholesome awe.

As there is in the common mind a deep respect for ministers of every name who are faithful to their commission, which the public regards as holy, and who exalt righteousness and command reverence for the authoritative sanctities of religion; so there is widespread resentment toward men who deal flippantly or irreverently with those sanctities, who vulgarize God, discredit the Holy Scriptures, and lower Jesus to a merely human level, representing him as ignorant, fallible, and even morally deficient. The best public is amazed and shocked at times at the liberties which the pulpit itself takes with the solemn trust supposed to be committed to it. When the clergy destroy faith in the Bible, unsettle religious belief, cut the cables which hold souls to safe anchorage, trifle with the most dearly cherished convictions of Christendom, or degrade the pulpit by playing the clown, they are not forgiven; and it is well when the general indignation which mutters in secret is peremptorily voiced by the high-minded secular press.

THE ARENA.

RECUPERATION IN NATURE: A SUGGESTION.

The writer has read with much pleasure and profit Professor Bennett's paper on "Science and Immortality," in the *Review* for September, 1900. His arguments are unanswerable. Yet we shall probably never have the final word upon this fundamental fact of sentient and moral being, simply because the finite mind is incapable of comprehending the whole of the finite. But we still "follow after," hoping to reach a better understanding of this fundamental fact of our existence.

The reading of the paper has suggested two additional arguments: First, the longing after immortality is an intimation that this desire may be attained. Well did Addison represent Cato as saying,

> Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
> This longing after immortality?

Is not "this pleasing hope, this fond desire" a part of that soul hunger and soul thirst expressed by David when he said, "My heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God?" Or, again, when he exclaims, "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God?" May we not consider "this pleasing hope, this fond desire" a part of that soul hunger and soul thirst mentioned in the beatitude? Whence this desire? "'Tis the divinity that stirs within us." It is this immortal man that remains

> Unhurt amidst the war of elements,
> The wreck of matter, and the crush of worlds.

Even those who have honestly—as Christian charity would lead us to suppose—doubted and denied immortality to sentient and moral beings have in the more sober and serious reflections of their life acknowledged the presence and potency of this longing for endless and conscious existence. The only rational explanation of that desire is the presence and potency of the fact itself upon which the desire rests. It is impossible that we should think of and long for a nonentity.

Secondly, the recuperative forces of nature suggest and are analogical of immortal existence. Job replied to the rationalism of Zophar, the Naamathite, by saying,

> For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again,
> And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
> Though the root thereof wax old in the earth,
> And the stock thereof die in the ground;
> Yet through the scent of water it will bud,
> And put forth boughs like a plant.

How persistent are the functional forces of nature. Girdle the tree

and it dies hard. Cut it down and it will sprout again. The ax of the woodman does not totally destroy the reproductive forces of the tree, but new forests rise from his ravages. Analogy is not fact. But it does suggest the presence and potency of the fact. In like manner these desires of the soul and their analogies in the silent, unseen recuperative forces of nature are unwritten gospels that help the soul in its aspirations for a better and immortal life:

> Thou wilt not leave us in the dust;
> Thou madest man, he knows not why;
> He thinks he was not made to die;
> And thou hast made him, thou art just.

Let him who will deny these facts, these gospels in nature; they are still solid footing for the soul, which circles in its placid round to reach that immortality and that rest which remaineth "to the people of God."

Whiteheath, Ill. S. R. Reno.

AFTER THE FAMINE, WHAT?

The cry of famine-stricken India has reached every ear and touched every heart that can be stirred to pity by human anguish. It is impossible to exaggerate the terrible suffering that will probably sweep away twenty millions of our fellow-men before this pitiless destroyer has stayed his hand. The Christian nations are moved with sympathy as never before, and the world is brought nearer together by that exhibition of human kindness which sends a million bushels of corn halfway round the world to feed famished men, most of whom are strangers to every motive that prompts such a deed. What matters it that they are heathen blacks? They are men for whom Christ died, our brothers, and they perish with hunger.

But, after the famine, what? Do the best that can be expected, and a multitude will die of hunger equal to one fourth of the population of the United States. And it is only three years ago that the conditions were the worst in modern India's whole history, except now. Is India to be forever passing from one famine to another, so quickly that there will be scarcely any cessation in the cry for her relief? Are there no lessons to be learned from the past? Is the only remedy for these terrible visitations to be found in letting the famine run its course until the population has been reduced to the level of the food supply? No believer in God the Father can for a moment entertain such a thought. The world is not overpopulated. India is not. God has provided amply for all his children. The trouble is that many are ignorant of how to obtain what Providence has prepared for them. This accounts for the extreme poverty in nearly all heathen lands. The problem is one of the most difficult before philanthropic people to-day. It is high time the question were being seriously asked, What can be done to prevent famine in India? "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound

of cure" is a very trite proverb, but it is distilled wisdom when applied to the Indian situation.

The causes of these famines may be broadly stated as three: First, lack of water; second, great stretches of uncultivated land; third, the poor agricultural methods practiced by the natives. As to the first, this is not noticed in the years of abundant rains, or when the "monsoon breaks" on schedule time and keeps up a steady downpour at the normal rate for the usual season. Then all is well. But unfortunately the monsoon refuses to be governed by the regulations of the weather bureau. It has been particularly contrary of late, and hence all this trouble. But is this state of things irremediable? Some of America's deserts have been changed into gardens of paradise by irrigation. Cannot this be done in India? Already the government has put nineteen million acres under irrigation at a cost of $125,000,000 gold. This is a splendid showing. Lord Curzon is reported as saying lately that only three and one half million acres more can be irrigated. But authorities differ upon this point. Sir Arthur Cotton, the father of irrigation works in India, claimed that the possible area was several times the viceroy's figures. It might be well for the government of India to call to its aid a few American irrigation engineers before settling down to the gloomy conclusion that the viceroy's figures are correct. Then the pumping of water from wells by windmills as is done in many Western States, or by hand, or cow power, or steam power where fuel is cheap, would greatly enlarge the area of water supply.

The second difficulty is one which the government could probably also do much to remedy. It is said that Indian native princes keep immense tracts of land for tiger hunting. Certainly this abuse could be taken hold of firmly by such a strong government as that of India. It is probable that the experience of the past few years would lead many of these princes voluntarily to reduce their hunting grounds, if their attention were called to it, for the sake of decreasing the probability of a recurrence of the famine. But there are large tracts of unused land that remain so because it is not profitable for the natives to cultivate them with their crude methods. With modern improvements and skill applied to these waste areas large sections could be made productive.

But the chief reason why India never has any surplus grain to tide it over a year of scarcity is the exceedingly primitive methods of agriculture practiced by the natives. The Hindus are among the poorest cultivators of the soil in the world. Dr. Arthur Smith, of China, has observed that in their neglect to use fertilizers the people of India are in striking contrast to the Chinese farmer, who carefully puts back upon his fields all he takes from them. Rev. W. H. Hollister, of the Kolar Industrial Mission in South India, has proved that the use of a properly made American plow will multiply a wheat crop by from three to five times over the best native plowing. To prevent famines in future it would seem to be necessary only to induce the Indian farmers to adopt a good

plow. But that is not so simple a task as it would at first appear. Most Asiatics are conservative to a degree that an American can scarcely imagine. It might cause a great rebellion for the Indian government to undertake to force the use of foreign plows upon all the peasantry.

But these wasteful methods must be changed, or India will continue to have a famine every time the monsoon fails. It will never be possible to get a grain supply ahead sufficient for even a few months, as long as the old methods of agriculture continue in use. Here is a field for philanthropy that is almost virgin soil. A rich harvest awaits the men and women who will come to India and put forth those Christian influences that will in a generation or two revolutionize their methods of agriculture and give plenty to these starving multitudes. We must bear in mind that the great majority of Hindus are underfed from the cradle to the grave. What they call plenty would be famine anywhere else in the world except in parts of China. Their famine is an acute attack of a disease that is chronic. What is the remedy? Let there be thickly scattered over that vast empire little oases in the form of industrial farms. The government of India is generous in its grants of land for such purposes. It will be more so now than ever before. The millions of famine orphans form an unlimited supply of material to work with. The Christian young men and women who are crowding the splendidly equipped agricultural schools in America and other countries could provide the leaders to bring every such well-planned enterprise to success. The missionary societies furnish the medium through which this great force can be set in motion for the uplifting of one fifth of the race—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

That such a plan is practicable is demonstrated by several successful industrial mission farms already in operation in various parts of India, notably one in the Northwest Provinces at Cherat, Aligarh. There are not less than three million acres of land called "Usar" or "desert," in these provinces alone. The ground has been considered useless for cultivation because of being impregnated with soda salt. For several years the government tried fruit raising and failed. Then Mr. Edward Keventer, a graduate of a Swedish agricultural college, took it up and started a dairy farm. The ground is subsoiled and a fertilizer is put under the surface. Gradually this desert is thus being redeemed. Over thirty acres are now producing vegetables and other crops of the best quality. The dairy is carried on according to the most improved modern methods. The butter is never touched by hand in the making. A ready sale is found for all that they can produce. Thirty orphans from the famine of 1897 do most of the work. Mr. Keventer is taking in a new lot from among the victims of the present famine. And what can be done on one desert farm could be duplicated indefinitely, if the men and women are found with the skill, experience, consecrated common sense, and patience to go there and do it. But if the Christian people do not do it, it will never be done. The government can do a little, but most

of its servants are working for pay. Theirs is not the type of self-surrender that will patiently toil for these little waifs washed up upon the shore of this fathomless sea of famine-stricken humanity. Unless this work is done for the love of Christ, it will not be done at all. Nor can it be accomplished by missionaries of the ordinary type and training. It is to the agricultural colleges, not to the theological seminaries, that the missionary societies must go to find the men who are fitted for this service. If the work is done at all, it must be undertaken in a business-like way. The workers must have had the best scientific training, and should have proven their ability as leaders and managers in their specialty by practical testing in the home land before sent to take charge of new and difficult enterprises so far from home.

Many missionaries in India have opened their doors to these starving orphans. They could not turn them away. They have prayed to the Father for bread for their little wards, and the story of their pitiable condition has brought help from across the sea. But this is only temporary relief. The famine will soon be over, the story will lose its freshness, attention will be withdrawn, the world will move on as before. But what of these multitudes of rescued children? Who will feed them then? Can the missionaries do it out of their meager salaries? They have children of their own to care for. Shall the orphans be turned adrift? That would be positively worse than to have let them starve during the famine. It would make fruitful Christian work among the natives of such a region impossible for a generation to come. It looks as though a divine Providence had brought about a situation that will force the great missionary societies to put these famine wards at work to help earn for themselves a living. At the same time they will learn improved methods of agriculture which in a few years they will take with them out into the villages where they are to spend their lives. These boys who have learned to use a good plow will never go back to the native implement. They will show their neighbors how to treble their crops and lighten their labor. Such a system, carried out upon a vast scale, would in a generation greatly reduce the chances of future famine. And when crops failed for a season, the suffering would not be so severe. The prosperous farmer does not live from hand to mouth. The "old corn of the land" helps tide him over until the next harvest, so that he manages to escape suffering.

The indirect benefits of such mission work upon the moral and spiritual welfare of the community can scarcely be overestimated. In the hands of spiritually minded leaders no line of mission work would produce larger soul-saving results. The living object lesson of the love of Christ before the surrounding heathen would be unmistakable and irresistible. Ought this work to be done? It most certainly ought. Then somebody can do it. And we believe it will be done. "All things are possible to him that believeth."

W. N. Brewster.

Hinghua, China.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

In order that the purpose which has prompted the formation of the following bibliography may be fully and precisely comprehended, it is necessary to say, by way of explanatory introduction, that it is not intended for the special student in theology, but for the practical, every-day use of the working minister. It does not, therefore, aim at exhaustiveness, though it seeks to be complete so far as really valuable works upon the subjects treated are concerned. Certain limitations, however, will be noted. For example, no attempt has been made to classify the large literature on the work of young people's societies or the Sunday school, however valuable many of the publications in these departments may be. In other cases—that is, in liturgics and catechetics—limitations have been imposed by the lack of good works which are to be found on the subject. In the arrangement the consideration of practical ends has been regarded, rather than scientific method. Under each of the three general divisions, excepting liturgics, a general list of works is given, and this is followed by detailed references under the various subtopics. At the close is appended a short list of books that are specially recommended for purchase to those who must limit their selection. In general, a rough attempt has been made to cite the works somewhat in the order of their value.

HOMILETICS.

Broadus, J. A., D.D., LL.D., *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons.* New York, Armstrong. $1.75.

Beecher, Henry Ward, *Lectures on Preaching*, Vols. I and III. New York, Ford. 1872 and 1874. $1.25 and $1.50.

Brooks, Bishop Phillips, D.D., *Lectures on Preaching.* New York, Dutton. 1880. $1.50.

Hoppin, J. M., D.D., *Homiletics.* New York, Funk & Wagnalls. 1883. $3.

Phelps, Austin, D.D., *The Theory of Preaching.* New York, Scribner. 1867. $2.

Blaikie, W. G., D.D., LL.D., *For the Work of the Ministry* (Homiletics and Pastoral Theology). New York, Scribner. 1883. $2.

Davies, G. J., *Papers on Preaching.* London, Bell. 1883. 6 shillings.

Dale, R. W., D.D., *Lectures on Preaching.* New York, Barnes. 1877. $1.25.

Fiske, F. W., D.D., *Manual of Preaching.* New York, Armstrong. 1884. $2.

Buckley, J. M., LL.D., *Extemporaneous Oratory.* New York, Eaton & Mains. 1899. $1.50.

Homiletical and Practical Lectures (Twenty Lectures by English Divines, with a preface by Bishop Ellicott). New York, Armstrong. 1880. $1.50.

Phelps, Austin, D.D., *English Style in Public Discourse.* New York, Scribner. 1883. $2.

The Preacher and Pastor, edited by Professor E. A. Park. Containing Fénelon's *Dialogues concerning Eloquence*, Herbert's *Country Parson*, Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*, Campbell's *Lectures on Pulpit Eloquence.* New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. 1849. $1.25.

Spurgeon, C. H., *Lectures to my Students.* New York, Sheldon. 1875. $1.25.

Alexander, J. W., *Thoughts on Preaching.* New York, Scribner. 1867. $2.

Simpson, Bishop Matthew, *Lectures on Preaching.* New York, Methodist Book Concern. 1879. $1.15.

Taylor, William M., *The Ministry of the Word.* New York, Randolph. 1876. $1.50.

Mullois, L'Abbé Isidore, *The Clergy and the Pulpit in their Relation to the People.* Translated. New York, Catholic Publication Society. 1867. $1.50.

Papers on Preaching. A Symposium. Chicago, Revell.

Hall, John, D.D., *God's Word through Preaching.* New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. 1875. $1.25.

Burton, N. J., D.D., *Lectures on Preaching.* New York, Webster. 1888. $3.75.

Phelps, Austin, D.D., *Men and Books;* or, Studies in Homiletics. New York, Scribner. 1882. $2.

Shedd, W. G. T., D.D., *Homiletics and Practical Theology.* New York, Scribner. 1875. $2.50.

Crosby, Howard, *The Christian Preacher.* New York, Randolph. 1880. $1.50.

Burgess, Henry, LL.D., *The Art of Preaching.* London, Baker. 1858.

Boynton, Nehemiah, D.D., *Real Preaching.* Boston, Congregational Publishing Society. 75 cents.

Broadus, J. A., D.D., LL.D., *Lectures on the History of Preaching.* New York, Armstrong. $1.50.

Christlieb, Theodore, *Homiletics.* Translated. New York, Scribner. 1895. $2.75.

Greer, D. H., D.D., *The Preacher and his Place.* New York, Scribner. 1895. $1.25.

Hood, E. Paxton, *The Vocation of the Preacher.* New York. Funk & Wagnalls. 1888. $2.

Horton, R. F., D.D., *The Word of God.* New York, Macmillan. 1893. $1.50.

Kidder, D. P., D.D., *A Treatise on Homiletics.* New York, Methodist Book Concern. 1864. $1.35.

Lindsey, James, M.A., B.D., *The Teaching Function of the Modern Pulpit.* Edinburgh, Blackwood. 1897. 1 shilling.

Pierson, A. T., D.D., *The Divine Art of Preaching.* New York, Baker & Taylor. 1872. 75 cents.

Parker, Joseph, *Ad Clerum:* Advices to a Young Preacher. Boston, Roberts. 1871. $1.50.

Theremin, Francis, *Eloquence a Virtue;* or, Outlines of Systematic Rhetoric. Translation and Introductory Essay by W. G. T. Shedd. Andover, Draper. 1872.

Vinet, A., *Homiletics.* New York, Ivison. 1880. $1.75.

SPECIAL REFERENCES IN HOMILETICS.

(For publisher, price, etc., if not given, see above.)

I. Books and Reading:

Dale, *Lectures on Preaching*, lectures 3 and 4.

Alexander, *Thoughts on Preaching*, letters 4, 5, 6, and 10.

Gladden, Washington, D.D., *The Christian Pastor*, chapter 5. New York, Scribner. $2.50.

Phelps, *Men and Books.*

Taylor, *The Ministry of the Word*, lectures 2 and 3.

Blackie, J. S., *Self-Culture.*

Porter, Noah, LL.D., *Books and Reading.* New York, Scribner. $2.

II. Sermon Preparation:

Beecher, *Lectures*, Vols. I and III.

Ecce Clerus, by a Student of his Times, chapter 7. New York, Methodist Book Concern. $1.50.

Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry*, chapters 3–11.

Claude, John, *Essay on the Composition of a Sermon.* Translation. New York, Methodist Book Concern. 1848. 40 cents.

Oosterzee, J. J. van, D.D., *Practical Theology.* Translation. Pp. 166–344. New York, Scribner. 1879. $3.50.

Compare also general works on homiletics noted above.

III. Extemporaneous Preaching:

Buckley, *Extemporaneous Oratory.*

Storrs, R. S., D.D., *Conditions of Success in Preaching without Notes.* New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. 1875. $1.

Alexander, *Thoughts on Preaching*, letters 7–9.

IV. The Delivery of the Sermon:

Russell, William, *Pulpit Elocution;* with an Introduction by Professor E. A. Park and Rev. E. N. Kirk. Andover, Draper. 1869. $1.

Buckley, *Extemporaneous Oratory*, chapters 20–29.

Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry*, chapter 13.

Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students*, lecture 8.

V. Preaching to Children:

Trumbull, H. C., *Yale Lectures on the Sunday School*, lectures 9 and 10. Philadelphia, Wattles. 1888.

Stall, Sylvanus, *Five-Minute Object Sermons to Children.* New York, Funk & Wagnalls. $1.

Armstrong, Rev. William, *Five-Minute Sermons to Children.* New York, Methodist Book Concern. 75 cents.

Howatt, Rev. J. Reid, *The Children's Pew.* New York, Whittaker. $1.50.

Outline Sermons to Children. New York, Armstrong. $1.50.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

Gladden, Washington, D.D., *The Christian Pastor and the Working Church.* New York, Scribner. 1898. $2.50.

Mead, G. W., *Modern Methods of Church Work.* New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.

Parish Problems, edited by Washington Gladden, D.D. New York, Century Co. 1887. $2.50.

Beecher, Henry Ward, *Lectures on Preaching*, Vol. II. New York, Ford. 1873. $1.50.

Hoppin, J. M., D.D., *Pastoral Theology.* New York, Funk & Wagnalls. 1884. $2.

Stall, Sylvanus, D.D., *Methods of Church Work.* New York, Funk & Wagnalls. 1887. $1.50

Cuyler, T. L., D.D., *How to be a Pastor.* New York, Baker & Taylor. 1890. 75 cents.

Ecce Clerus; or, The Christian Minister in Many Lights, by a Student of his Times. New York, Eaton & Mains. $1.50.

Bridges, Charles, A.M., *The Christian Ministry;* with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency (Pastoral and Homiletic Theology). New York, Carter. 1859. $1.50.

The Clerical Life. A Series of Letters to Ministers (by Watson, Dodds, Edwards, Denney, etc.). New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.25.

Oosterzee, J. J. van, D.D., *Practical Theology* (Homiletics, Pastoral Theology, and Liturgics). Translation. New York, Scribner. 1879. $3.50.

Fairbairn, Patrick, D.D., *Pastoral Theology.* New York, Scribner. $2.25.

Kidder, D. P., D.D., *The Christian Pastorate.* New York, Methodist Book Concern. 1871. $1.20.

Murphy, Thomas, D.D., *Pastoral Theology.* Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board Publication. 1877. $1.25.

Thwing, C. F., D.D., *The Working Church.* New York, Baker & Taylor. 75 cents.

Vinet, A., *Pastoral Theology.* Translated by T. O. Summers. Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1875. $1.

Blaikie, W. G., D.D., LL.D., *The Public Ministry and Pastoral Methods of Our Lord.* New York, Carter. 1874. $1.50.

Herbert, George, Life and Writings of, including "The Country Parson." Boston, Monroe. 1851. $1.25.

Baxter, Richard, *The Reformed Pastor.* New York, Methodist Book Concern. 60 cents.

SPECIAL REFERENCES IN PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

(For publisher, price, etc., if not given, see general list above.)

I. The Office of the Minister :
Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry*, chapters 1 and 2.
Gladden, *The Christian Pastor*, chapters 3 and 4.
Hoppin, *Pastoral Theology*, Part I.
Simpson, *Lectures on Preaching*, lectures 1 and 2.

II. Character and Habits of the Minister:
Ecce Clerus, chapter 4.
Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry*, chapter 20.
Bridges, *The Christian Ministry*, Part III.
Crosby, *The Christian Preacher*, lectures 4 and 5.
Hoppin, *Pastoral Theology*, Parts II and III.
Mullois, *The Clergy and the Pulpit*, chapter 1.
Miller, Samuel, D.D., *Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits.* Princeton, Baker. 1835. $1.25.
Stalker, James, D.D., *The Preacher and his Models.* New York, Armstrong. 1891. $1.50.
Tucker, W. J., *The Making and Unmaking of the Preacher.* Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1898. $1.50.
Simpson, *Lectures on Preaching*, lectures 2 and 3.

III. Pastoral Visiting:
Cuyler, *How to be a Pastor*, chapters 1-3.
Gladden, *The Christian Pastor*, chapters 7 and 11.
Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry*, chapter 15.
Parish Problems, pp. 179–190.
Hoppin, *Pastoral Theology*, pp. 387–437.
Watson, John, *The Cure of Souls*, chapter 7. New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. 1896. $1.50.
Wells, J. D., D.D., *The Pastor in the Sick Room.* Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board Publication. 1893. 50 cents.

IV. Christian Nurture and Catechetics:
Bushnell, Horace, D.D., *Christian Nurture.* New York, Scribner. $1.50.
Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry*, chapter 16.
Chesebrough, A. S., D.D., *The Culture of Child Piety.* Boston, Congregational Publishing Society. 1886. $1.25.

Adler, Felix, *The Moral Instruction of Children.* New York, Appleton. 1892. $1.50.

Oosterzee, *Practical Theology*, pp. 448–509.

Gladden, *The Christian Pastor*, chapter 15.

Reference may also be made here to the many catechetical works, old and new, issued by churches and individuals. Such are *Luther's Shorter Catechism*, *The Westminster Shorter Catechism*, *The Heidelberg Catechism* (that recently issued by the Union of the Nonconformist Churches of England), *An Evangelical Catechism* by Thomas Chalmers, Nast's *Larger Catechism*, Schaff's *Catechism*, *An Elementary Catechism* by M. C. Hazard, *Child's Scripture Catechism* issued by the American Tract Society, *Gospel Truth* by J. W. Cooper, *The Christian Faith* by G. A. Jackson, *Great Truths Simply Told* by G. L. Weed, and *Our Children for Christ* by Doremus Scudder.

V. The Prayer Meeting:

Vincent, Bishop J. H., *How to Conduct Prayer Meetings.* Boston, Lothrop. 1880. $1.25.

Parish Problems, pp. 253–268.

Beecher, *Lectures on Preaching*, Vol. II, chapters 3 and 4.

Gladden, *The Christian Pastor*, chapter 10.

Groat, W. H., *The Ideal Prayer Meeting.* Chicago, Revell. 50 cents.

VI. Revivals:

Peck, J. O., D.D., *The Revival and the Pastor.* New York, Methodist Book Concern. 1894. $1.

Pierson, A. T., D.D., *Evangelistic Work in Principle and in Practice.* New York, Baker & Taylor. $1.25.

Finney, C. G., *Lectures on Revivals.* Boston, Jowett. 1835. $1.75.

Beecher, *Lectures*, Vol. II, chapters 8–11.

Gladden, *The Christian Pastor*, chapter 17.

Hoppin, *Pastoral Theology*, pp. 480–512.

LITURGICS.

I. The Reading of Scripture and Hymns:

Russell, William, *Pulpit Elocution.* Andover, Draper. 1869. $1.

Taylor, W. M., *The Ministry of the Word*, chapter 9. New York, Randolph. 1876. $1.50.

See, also, works above under "The Delivery of the Sermon."

II. Public Prayer and Common Prayer:

The Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Beecher, Henry Ward, *Prayers from Plymouth Pulpit.* New York, Scribner. 1867. $1.50.

Pulpit Prayers by Eminent Preachers. New York, Armstrong. 1884. $1.50.

Blaikie, W. G., *For the Work of the Ministry*, chapter 14. New York, Scribner. $2.

Dale, R. W., D.D., *Lectures on Preaching*, lecture 9. New York, Barnes. $1.25.

Porter, Ebenezer, D.D., *Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching, and on Public Prayer.* New York, Collier. 1844. $1.25.

Spurgeon, C. H., *Lectures to My Students*, lecture 4. New York, Sheldon. $1.25.

Hungerford, Edward, *The American Book of Church Services, with Selections for Responsive Readings.* Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889. $1.25.

Miller, Samuel, D.D., *Thoughts on Public Prayer.* Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board Publication. 75 cents.

Oosterzee, J. J. van, *Practical Theology*, pp. 403–415. New York, Scribner. $3.50.

III. Responsive Services:

Sunday Service and Select Psalms, by John Wesley. Edited by C. S. Harrower, D.D. New York, Methodist Book Concern. 45 cents.

Responsive Scripture Lessons, arranged by J. F. Marley, D.D. New York, Eaton & Mains. 20 cents.

Hungerford, *American Book of Church Services.*

Parish Problems, pp. 462–468. New York, Century Co. $2.50.

IV. Church Music:

Gladden, *The Christian Pastor*, pp. 139–150. New York, Scribner. $2.50.

Beecher, *Lectures on Preaching*, Vol. II, chapter 5. New York, Ford. $1.50.

Parish Problems, pp. 422–461.

Bridges, Robert, *A Practical Discourse on Some Principles of Hymn Singing.* Journal of Theological Studies, October, 1899. New York, Macmillan.

Julian, John, M.A., *Dictionary of Hymnology.* New York, Scribner. 1891. $10.

On the general subject of Christian worship, compare also the the following works:

Parish Problems, pp. 401–476.

Broadus, *Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, Part V. New York, Armstrong. $1.75.

Watson, John, *The Cure of Souls*, chapter 8. New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.

Christian Worship, by C. C. Hall, Thomas Hastings, A. V. G. Allen, E. C. Smyth, W. R. Huntington, etc. New York, Scribner. $1.50.

SELECT LIST RECOMMENDED FOR PURCHASE.

HOMILETICS.

Broadus, John A., D.D., LL.D., *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons.* New York, Armstrong. $1.75.

Beecher, Henry Ward, *Lectures on Preaching*, Vols. I and III. New York. Ford, 1872 and 1874. $1.25 and $1.50.

Brooks, Bishop Phillips, D.D., *Lectures on Preaching.* New York, Dutton. 1880. $1.50.

Hoppin, J. M., D.D., *Homiletics.* New York, Funk & Wagnalls. 1883. $3.

Phelps, Austin, D.D., *The Theory of Preaching.* New York, Scribner. 1867. $2.

Blaikie, W. G., D.D., LL.D., *For the Work of the Ministry* (Homiletics and Practical Theology). New York, Scribner. 1883. $2.

Davies, G. J., *Papers on Preaching.* London, Bell. 1883. 6 shillings.

Buckley, J. M., LL.D., *Extemporaneous Oratory.* New York, Methodist Book Concern. 1899. $1.50.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

Gladden, Washington, D.D., *The Christian Pastor and the Working Church.* New York, Scribner. 1898. $2.50.

Mead, G. W., *Modern Methods of Church Work.* New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.

Parish Problems, edited by Washington Gladden, D.D. New York, Century Co. 1887. $2.50.

Beecher, Henry Ward, *Lectures on Preaching*, Vol. II. New York, Ford. 1873. $1.50.

Hoppin, J. M., D.D., *Pastoral Theology.* New York, Funk & Wagnalls. 1884. $2.50.

Stall, Sylvanus, D.D., *Methods of Church Work.* New York, Funk & Wagnalls. 1887. $1.50

Cuyler, T. L., D.D., *How to be a Pastor.* New York, Baker & Taylor. 1890. 75 cents.

LITURGICS.

Sunday Service and Select Psalms, by John Wesley. Edited by C. S. Harrower, D.D. New York, Methodist Book Concern. 45 cents.

Hungerford, Edward, *The American Book of Church Services, with Selections for Responsive Readings.* Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889. $1.25.

Beecher, Henry Ward, *Prayers from Plymouth Pulpit.* New York, Scribner. 1867. $1.50.

Christian Worship, by Hall, Hastings, Allen, etc. New York, Scribner. $1.50.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

BABYLONIAN EXPLORATIONS.

THERE never has been any greater activity in this field of exploration than during the past twelve months, nor have the efforts of these patient toilers ever been crowned with greater success. To dig for antiquities is, at best, but very uncertain work, and often has it been that one has sown and another reaped. Dr. Koldewy has been working diligently, for more than a year, at the supposed site of one of Nebuchadnezzar's palaces with indifferent success, for the number of objects found has been quite few and of no special interest. Quite close to the palace he came across a small temple which belonged to the goddess Ninmakh, where fifty or more cuneiform tablets were found, none of them, however, being of any special value to the Bible student.

From the *Sunday School Times* and other sources we learn that the last expedition of the University of Pennsylvania to Nippur was by far the most successful of any archæological exploration of the recent past. Even Dr. Hilprecht himself is exceedingly pleased with the results of the season's work, as the reader may gather from the following extract from his pen. He says: "All the three expeditions—American, French, and German—which have been excavating in northern, central, and southern Babylonia respectively, have had peculiar and valuable results; but the greatest and epoch-making result of this year was obtained by the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania through the discovery of the oldest and foremost Babylonian temple library (destroyed about 2280 B. C.) and the huge pre-Sargonic palace of the fourth pre-Christian millenium, buried under more than seventy feet of *débris*." It is understood that among the many objects discovered there were many vases, a very large number of clay, shoe-shaped coffins, and nearly twenty thousand inscribed tablets of varying ages. This old sanctuary has already yielded nearly one hundred thousand documents of all sorts, and probably when as fully explored as some other archæological remains will yield as many more.

It is too early yet to predict the contents of these venerable clay books, written ages upon ages before Abraham left his native land. It will doubtless take many years to decipher these thousands of tablets, for the number of those capable of reading them may be counted upon one's fingers. One of the fragments already read brings out a new king, En-shag-shur-an-a, who reigned about 6500 B. C. Early as this date is, it was not too early for discontent and war; for we read that this king with a long name made war against the ruler of a neighboring country and defeated him, carrying his treasures as trophies into the temple of Bel.

There was a time when certain Bible critics ridiculed the account given in Gen. xiv of Chedorlaomer and his allies who made a campaign from the distant north through Syria and Palestine to the region south of the Dead Sea. Archæology came to the rescue, and followed Sargon I (about 3800 B. C.) step by step as he marched, nearly a thousand years before the days of Chedorlaomer, along the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea. And now again comes another mighty conqueror, Lugal-zay-gis-i, who seems "to have been a veritable Alexander." If we can trust the tablets, this ruler, who flourished about 4500 B. C., or fully 700 before Sargon I, also led his victorious armies from Babylonia to Palestine.

HIGH PLACE AT PETRA.

THE last number of the *Quarterly Statement*, the organ of the Palestine Exploration Fund, is exceedingly rich in good articles, of which none is more interesting to the Bible student than the paper by Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss, D.D., entitled "High Place and Altar at Petra." The article is elaborately illustrated with photographs taken on the spot, and has a well-executed plan of the "high place" and the surrounding area, as well as an isometric sketch of the altar by Mr. R. A. Macalister, who is widely and creditably known in connection with Dr. Bliss's latest researches in Palestine.

Petra, situated about midway between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akaba, not far from Mount Hor, is an old Edomite stronghold, known in the Bible by its Hebrew name, "Sela," that is, "rock." (See 2 Kings xiv, 7, and Isa. xvi, 1.) The place has ever been difficult of access, and has been made the more so by the hostile tribes in and around it. But the few travelers who have visited it speak in high terms of the imposing ruins and interesting antiquities. It is, however, a little strange that this high place and altar had escaped the notice of such experienced travelers and archæologists as Seetzen, Burkhardt, Laborde, Robinson, Stanley, Palmer, and many later ones. Even Baedeker's last edition of *Syria and Palestine*, though devoting considerable space to Petra and its ruins, has not a word concerning this old sanctuary, which only emphasizes the fact that many a place in Bible lands has not yet disclosed its secrets or given up its buried treasures. There is reason for expecting great discoveries in the future.

It is also a matter of surprise—though an American traveler, Edward A. Wilson, editor of the *Photographic Magazine*, called attention to the Petra altar as long ago as 1891—that little or no attention was paid to the matter, but that the whole subject was allowed to pass with scarcely a notice from any quarter. Mr. Wilson, it is true, knew the nature of this discovery, for he describes this rock-hewn temple as "one of the altars in high places consecrated to Baal;" but he evidently did not appreciate its importance, possibly because it did not show off to advantage in a photograph. Be that as it may, it was nearly ten years later before

the learned world was fully informed regarding this ancient monument. For it was not till last May that Professor G. L. Robinson, of Chicago, made a trip through the regions west and south of the Dead Sea and announced his important "find" at Wady Musa, or ancient Petra. Whether or not he had ever heard of Mr. Wilson's previous discovery is not stated, nor is it of any great importance, for all students of Semitic religions will thank Professor Robinson for his important contribution to this branch of study. And as he did not have time at his disposal to make a careful examination of this old sanctuary, it was furthermore very fortunate that his friend, Professor Curtiss, was in Palestine at the time, and that this scholar a few weeks later, in company with some friends, repaired to Petra with the intention, which they successfully carried out, of making a thorough study of the altar.

As already stated, the results of his observations are published by Professor Curtiss in the article above mentioned, from which we learn that the altar is situated on a ledge of rocks about five hundred and twenty feet long by ninety feet wide, a little north of Petra's citadel. The ledge itself rises to a height of several hundred feet above the valley, and is the very center of an "amphitheater of hills and mountains which are still much higher." The altar was not built, but was hewn out of the solid rock, from which it is separated on all sides except that on the east, that is, the side from which the priest approached and that on which the interested spectator stood. The altar proper measures nine feet one inch by six feet two inches. Its height at the highest point is exactly three feet. On the top or surface of the altar, very near the center, is cut out a hollow place in the shape of a pan, measuring forty-four inches by fourteen, and having a depth of three and a half inches. This might have been used for the fire. There are also small holes cut into this solid altar on three sides, which, according to a theory advanced by Professor Curtiss, suggest metallic altar horns. Why there were not four of these is impossible to say. Before the altar are four steps of easy ascent, one of these being a large slab over a yard long and about two feet wide. It was on this step, we judge, that the officiating priest in all probability took his stand while he was attending to the sacrificial service.

On the south side and within two feet of the altar is a platform sixteen feet six inches by eleven feet, which is ascended by four steps of unequal size, at the northeast corner. It is almost certain that this platform was used by the priests and those attending them in preparing the victim for the altar. This is made the more probable from the fact that connected with the platform are two "circular and concentric pans with vertical sides, . . . with a conduit leading from the lower pan, which may have served to carry away the blood of the victim." A short distance to the east of the altar is a space forty-seven feet four inches by twenty-four feet four inches, which is cut down to the solid rock some fifteen or eighteen inches. Near the center of this sunken area is a raised

platform only five feet by two feet seven inches, and four inches high. If Mr. Macalister's supposition is correct, this slight elevation in the center was the place upon which the one offering the sacrifice stood during the ceremony, the rest of the area being occupied by other worshipers.

Though high places and religious services connected with them are often mentioned in the Old Testament we have nowhere any description of them such as to afford us any idea of their arrangement. That they had altars we know, but nothing is said of their shape, size, or construction. This article of Professor Curtiss is, therefore, of genuine interest to every student of Semitic antiquities; for, as Petra was within the territory of Moab or Edom, countries having much in common in their religious institutions with other Semitic tribes, including the idolatrous Israelites at various times in their history, this rock altar may have been the exact counterpart of those on the hills of Judea. However that may be, and of course we cannot be entirely sure of the facts. this ancient altar at which a guilty soul tried to appease the wrath of some offended divinity is an object of genuine interest to every intelligent and studious Bible reader.

The professor calls attention also to two large monoliths, a little to the east of the citadel. Both of them are about eighteen feet high, with lateral dimensions varying at the base from five to eleven feet, and about two feet and a half at the top. There is every reason for regarding these as in some way connected with religious worship, for, like the pillars and *mazzebas* of the Hebrew Scriptures, they most likely symbolized the divine presence. Professor Whitehouse, in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, goes so far as to say that the *mazzeba* was the never-failing accompaniment of the *bamah*, that is, high place, and that in "the primitive sanctuary of the early Semites the upright stone served as altar and divine symbol in one," but that, in the course of time, the altar and *mazzeba* became separated the one from the other. The fact that there are two of these is also significant, for the twin pillars, associated in religious worship, were well known outside of Edom. We find them in the Phœnician *cultus*. The Temple of Melkart, at Tyre, for instance, had two magnificent ones, which are fully described by Herodotus; and the Bible reader is acquainted with the two pillars, Boaz and Jachin, in the temple of Solomon (1 Kings vii, 15–21), which were very probably imitations of those in Phœnician temples. Though the Israelites were clearly commanded, as early as the Exodus (Exod. xxiii, 24), to destroy such pillars, and were absolutely forbidden to erect them near their altars (Deut. xvi, 22), yet it is evident that the injunction remained a dead letter during a good part of the monarchy, especially in the northern kingdom. Hence the denunciations of the prophets, as in Hos. iii. 5, and Mic. v, 13. The existence of Boaz and Jachin in Solomon's temple is difficult to harmonize with the spirit of the Mosaic law. This is surely one of the most inviting fields and subjects for research.

MISSIONARY REVIEW.

THE BIBLE IN FOREIGN MISSION FIELDS.

That the American Bible Society should take a prominent place in the Ecumenical Conference on Foreign Missions was not a mere compliment. The society has become, more and more, a foreign missionary society since its issues for other countries now exceed those for use at home. Of the nearly one and one half millions of copies for the year ending in May last, over eight hundred thousand copies were distributed outside of the United States. One of its agents in South America says that the work of their society on that part of the western hemisphere would itself vitiate the now somewhat popular designation of South America as "the neglected continent." The Bible Society has work in eight of the ten great republics into which the continent is divided, having grown from a single agency in a single province of a single republic within thirty-five years, and its itineraries would mark the map from ocean to ocean. Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia, Paraguay, Chili, Peru, Ecuador, and Brazil are all permeated with the operations of this organization. Of course its influence is limited by the heavy percentage of illiterates throughout the territory and by the antagonism of the Roman priests, which, however, seems to be less and less influential. The marked eagerness for the word is still a prominent feature in the general situation, as are the number of cases of conversion from the mere reading of the Scriptures. The discovery of the numerous instances, in all parts of the land, where isolated persons or small communities have found Christ without the known aid of the living teacher is part of a widespread phenomenon, certified to in nearly all heathen lands where the Scriptures have been circulated. There is a marked preparedness for the reception of the Holy Scriptures to which, also, the experience of Bible distribution attests in widely separated communities, and in some cases where it would not have been anticipated. This has been strangely true in East Central Africa, and is being experienced amongst the Filipinos as unaccountable, except "by the preparation and power of the Holy Ghost."

As the Church enters on the work of the twentieth century it must count as among its assets the influence of the three hundred millions of Bibles, Testaments, and other portions of Scripture distributed through the agency of the Bible societies alone in the nineteenth century. It is to the credit of American Christianity that, of these, sixty-seven and one third millions have been issued by the American Bible Society. God's answer to criticisms on the book has been, in the century just closed, the greatest circulation for it of any book in any century. We have now over four hundred translations of the Scriptures, and in

many cases the inspiration to reduce a language to writing was solely the desire to give the people speaking it the word of God. The very alphabet was invented to this end, in these cases. A glance at a list of seventy-two Bible societies shows what Canon Edmonds has said, that "whatever is the share of other lands, America, Germany, and Great Britain are clearly put in trust of the Gospel. They must translate and they must distribute it. . . . The missionary idea is conquering the life of the Churches. The living Churches are alive to it and live by it; but let us be zealous for the stability and authority, as well as the fervor, of our work. The word of God is the most living of all God's oracles, the most evangelical of all evangelists, the most trustworthy of all God's messengers."

THE SPREAD OF MOHAMMEDANISM.

THERE is much made of the advance of Islam in several portions of the world; but the fact needs a careful analysis, in order to avoid a false impression being made. One Mr. Oscar Mann, described as "an American student of comparative religion," has written in the *North American Review* without full information, or without regard to it, about the growth of Mohammedanism in India. First, he basis his argument on what he calls the "absolutely reliable publications of the India government in the census of India." That the last census approached a reliability not equal by any previous census is true, but that it was "absolutely" reliable no one who is acquainted with the facts would claim. The trouble with Mr. Mann's argument is that he deals with the census of ten years before as "absolutely" reliable, when its imperfections are so well known that it is regarded, in the matter of religious and some other items, as lacking accuracy, though it was the best that could be taken at the time. There was territory covered in the later census not included in that of the earlier one, and that itself would disturb comparisons. But, taken on its face, the advance of the Moslems is only in the ratio of the increase of population. They numbered one in five in 1881, and the same in 1891. The truth is that this is surprising, considering the announced growth of Moslem in lower Bengal among the non-caste races. We are prepared to believe that the relative increase is greater than Mr. Mann's statistical statements show, for in the aggregate for all India they show none at all.

In China, the showing, as everyone knows who knows anything about it, can be only a happy guess at the best. The record of *Statesman's Year Book* has no confirmation, and even if its computed increase of two millions of Moslems in that empire be accepted, Mr. Mann's hurdle-leaping logic, that this is "considerably more than the proportional increase," is only amusing. Still, the probabilities are that the number of Moslems in China has considerably advanced in the last quarter of a century, even without nullifying the statement, as Mr. Mann does, by accusing the Moslems of compromises with native idolatrous customs. The author

shows himself a neophite in the study of comparative religions in speaking of these countries as affording an "almost unexampled missionary success," especially when he thinks he has established the fact that Islam has barely maintained its status in the old Moslem lands of Asia and has decreased in some portions even of these.

The extension of Islam in Africa is acknowledged on all hands, as it has followed the Arab extension over the continent. Its reception has been demanded as an alternative of slave-raiding, conversion being the acceptance of the simplest formula—"There is no god but God, and Mohammed is his prophet"—the first part of which is not at war with the underlying belief in all African races of the unity of God, however many subordinate fetiches they may fear. Still, even the progress of Islam along Arab trade routes is scarcely phenomenal, considering that it has been in Africa for a thousand years. The assertion ceases to be astounding, when the facts are viewed in this light, that one half the continent is "dominated by Islam, and of the remaining half one quarter is leavened by it and another threatened by it." Nevertheless, the fact of the extension of Islam over Africa is one to be reckoned with by the Christian propagandist, since it may not be as easy to convert even nominally Moslem communities to Christianity as to evangelize the "raw heathen." The Uganda mission work, however, does not indicate that even the Moslem communities hold very stubbornly to Islam far outside the Sudan. Certainly experience has not proved that it is either dangerous or useless to meddle with Islam in large parts of Africa.

Nor does it appear that this crude Islam is difficult to influence in other quarters of the globe. The extension of Islam in the Malaysian islands, as Java and Borneo, was not long since quoted as an alarming indication of its progress, just as is now said of its growth in lower Bengal and central and west Africa. But the success of the Dutch and Rhenish missions indicates it to be idle for the Church to conclude that these communities are inaccessible to Christian effort. The largest part of the more than thirty thousand Battak Christians are converts from Mohammedanism, and in some parts of Java still larger results are claimed. That the Mohammedans of Java have a mongrel form of that faith, which has made it so distinct as to be called "Javaism," is indicative of the actual nature of many of the crude accessions which are credited to Islam, when it is said to be making great strides over the world. Large portions of the accretions of Islam in India, China, and Africa are merely of the nature of a conglomerate of Islam and the old superstitious faiths and heathen usages of the communities.

The fanaticism of Mohammedanism inheres not so much in its doctrinal system as in the politico-ecclesiastic tenets about the caliphate. It is the doctrine of the sultan as pope or caliph—at once king and ruler of State and Church—that becomes the center of Moslem fanaticism. Great numbers of Moslems would accept Christ if they could be shown protection from the scimiter of the sultan and his political associates.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

L. Clasen. The certainty of our relation to God is a subject that is of perennial interest. Clasen, a pastor, has given so much thought to it that his opinions deserve attention. He has set them forth in a work entitled *Die christliche Heilsgewissheit* (Christian Assurance), published in Halle by E. Strien. To some Clasen's views will be less welcome because he is an out-and-out Ritschlian in his theology. Nevertheless, to Protestants who do not trust in the Church to insure their salvation the subject is one of such profound importance that we should be thankful to anyone who can shed any light on it. For Clasen is probably correct in thinking that the differences of opinion on this matter are in some considerable measure responsible for the lack of assurance on the part of so many Christians. And we agree with him in the affirmation that modern theology has no more important task than to exhibit the nature of Christian assurance, and that the final purpose of all preaching, teaching, and pastoral labor is to implant this assurance in every heart. Clasen holds that assurance is not an externally established, sensible fact, but it is the work of God through Christ. It is fellowship with God; experience of pardon or justification; certitude of a new birth; a new life of love to God and man, together with a new estimate of self and a new attitude to the world. This assurance, which is summed up by Paul in Rom. viii, 38 f., is wrought objectively by Christ, whose power over us is immediate, but subjectively by faith in Jesus Christ as a person. From all this Clasen draws certain conclusions: Assurance is, in reference to God, a state of perfection which shows itself in prayer and in confidence in God's providence; but it is also love to our neighbor, faithfulness in our life-calling, and superiority to the demands of the earthward aspect of our life. Doctrine has only so much value, as if derived from its ability to aid us in the religious life and, in the last analysis, in attaining Christian assurance. This is, in fact, to say that Christian assurance is Christian experience, or, in other words, that one who has a Christian experience has Christian assurance. This is true only within limits. The vast majority find it true, and for the majority nothing further is needed. Yet there is a minority who have had this very experience, but who have gone into the depths of skepticism in spite of it. There are many other facts besides the facts of Christian experience; and it is possible so to conceive these other facts as to render doubtful the divine source of this experience. Whenever this doubt becomes strong the very foundations of assurance, as laid by Clasen, are swept away. Many cannot reconcile these other facts with the facts of Christianity. Hence it is not so simple a matter as Clasen supposes, ex-

cept in those instances when doubts of the divine origin of experience have never arisen. Christian assurance, in other words, has its intellectual as well as its emotional aspects.

E. W. Mayer. Why does the Christian trust in God? To this question Mayer has given us a very interesting answer in *Das christliche Gottvertrauen und der Glaube an Christus* (The Relation of Faith in Christ to Confidence in God), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899. In some measure people of all religions trust in God, though outside of Christianity there is nothing to elicit the idea of an unconditionally good higher power. Even in Christendom the individual consciousness of sin and the evils of the world somewhat hinders confidence in God. Through Christ these hindrances are removed. But what is the relation of faith in Christ to confidence in God? In the best periods of Christianity faith in Christ is the presupposition and cause of confidence in God, although the faith in Christ here spoken of is not, either according to the New Testament or the principles of the Reformation, connected with any particular theory of Christ's saving work. That which is essential to true faith in Christ is the feeling sense of certainty that Jesus, as the representative of God and the manifestation of the grace and truth of God, has brought to man the external divine gifts of salvation. This does not mean that no work pleasing to God can be done except in cases in which faith in Christ cooperates, but that as a matter of fact such works are performed only within Christendom, while he who does them is more or less conscious of the influence of Christ in his act. Mayer draws certain practical conclusions from all this, especially for those who have to do with the public preaching of the Gospel. The Christian preacher must set the historical Christ before his hearers as the herald and bringer of the kingdom of God—who gave his most loving attention to repentant sinners, to those who hungered and thirsted after righteousness, and to the weary and heavy laden, and who carried through his work, even in the midst of poverty, suffering, and death. But, in order to the effective preaching of Christ in all these aspects, the preacher must show by his words and deeds that he has himself the present experience of the reality of this new life in Jesus Christ. The thoughts which Mayer has given us here are worthy the attention both of professional theologians and practical workers in the Lord's vineyard. It is greatly to be feared that the "preaching of Christ" is neglected in our day, and that this is the principal reason why so few are "converted to God." There is such a thing as preaching about Christ without presenting the one preached about in such a way as to win men to faith in his claims and to labor for him. But there is another aspect of the whole subject not treated by Mayer. Men may have a restful confidence in God as good, because they believe that Christ was the express image

of God's person, and yet be most un-Christlike in that they fail utterly to participate in the sufferings of Christ. Only that is true faith in God which sets men to work on the tasks which God has for all his children in Christ.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Die Bergpredigt nach Matthäus (The Sermon on the Mount according to Matthew). By Friedrich Grawert. Marburg, N. G. Elwert, 1900. This author does not believe that the Sermon on the Mount as recorded by Matthew is a compilation of the sayings of our Lord, but a unit. He does not believe that it is a didactic address concerning his attitude toward the law, nor a doctrinal address giving the fundamental principles of the kingdom of God, nor an ethical treatise of any kind. He thinks that all such conceptions of the sermon are misleading. On the other hand, he is of the opinion that the discourse had for its occasion a specific situation in which Christ found himself. The Jewish opposition had reached a great height before this sermon was delivered, and had taken the form of an accusation that Jesus was a destroyer of the law. In order to defend himself against this charge and to convince his disciples of its injustice, Christ delivered this address and accompanied it with an accusation that his opponents were themselves violaters of the commandments of God (Matt. v, 17–37). This is followed by instruction to the disciples relative to their conduct toward the unfriendly world (chapter v, 38–48), and this by a warning against the false piety of the Pharisee and a description of true piety (chapter vi, 1–18). Then Jesus gives his disciples instruction concerning their faith and its purpose (chapter vi, 19–34) and the character of a Christian disciple (chapter vii, 1–11). The remainder of the sermon is an epilogue, as what preceded chapter v, 17, is a prologue, the eight blessings of which correspond in reverse order of statement to the principal points of the sermon, as follows: v, 3 = vii, 7–11; v, 4 = vii, 3–6; v, 5 = vii, 1, 2; v, 6 = vi, 1–34; v, 7 = v, 38–48; v, 8 = v, 27–37; v, 9 = v, 17–26; v, 10 = v, 11–16. Grawert confesses that the comparison of the first three blessings with chapter vii, 1–11, is not easy to make, though he thinks the thoughts correspond. Since the quintessence of the sermon is founded in these blessings he thinks the unity of the discourse is demonstrated. The thesis is at least interesting, and perhaps it is not without truth. Still it is strange that along with the difficulty of making the identification he has made there should go the unnatural reversal of order, which the author thinks he has established, though it must be confessed that an exact reverse, if it could be made reasonably sure, would be in favor of his contention of unity. Nevertheless, it rather favors the unity given to the parts by the composer of the Gospel than by Jesus. For, if he spoke under the stress Grawert supposes, he would not likely employ so artificial an arrangement. So that the whole outcome of Grawert's

theory, if proven, would be to confirm the idea that the sermon as Matthew gives it is a compilation of sayings of Jesus, rather than an address of Jesus given at any one time. But, if this be true, then the sermon was not occasioned as Grawert supposes.

Ueber den biblischen und kirchlichen Begriff der Anrechnung. Ein Beitrag zur Rechtfertigungslehre (The Doctrine of Imputation as Taught in Bible and Church. A Contribution to the Doctrine of Justification). By Adolph Zahn. Amsterdam, Scheffer & Co., 1899. The author of this book must not be confused with his cousin, Theodor Zahn, who is an abler man. We call attention to this book for a specific purpose. Adolph Zahn has recently been making a good deal of noise in the theological world, especially by his opposition to the newer views of theology and the Bible. Not a few—among them some Methodists—have hailed him as a scholar who is to lead us back to the truth. That Methodists, at least, should not appeal to him as a leader will be apparent from the teachings of his book above mentioned. According to his views the doctrine of imputed righteousness is the key to the whole of sacred Scripture. The doctrine experienced no development as taught in the Bible. Indeed, the very nature of the word of God is such as to compel the supposition that there can be no development in doctrine in the Bible, but that God said at the beginning what he ever afterward repeated. Hence the Pauline doctrine of imputation is found away back in Gen. xv, 6. It is essential to note that the imputation of righteousness takes place with those who have no righteousness in themselves, but who on the contrary are unrighteous. The Abraham that believed was the godless Abraham, and yet he was looked upon and esteemed in the thought of God as righteous. He was most godless at the time of this imputation of righteousness. The idea of imputation rules both the Old and the New Testament. The relation of Christ to his disciples is one of constant imputation. Paul brings this out with especial force. The καταταγή is nothing but one great exchange in which the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ are imputed to the godless. Christ had to become flesh in order that the sin of Adam could be imputed to him. For fourteen centuries this doctrine was lost, but the reformers restored it to us, and the orthodoxy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries held it fast. But through pietism, rationalism, and modern theology the doctrine has been lost to Protestantism. Revelation is wholly predestinarian. One must either be a biblical theologian—and then he will be a Calvinist—or else must be a synergist and distinguish between God's and man's part in conversion. Man has not and cannot have the slightest part in his own conversion, not even to consent to the same. Every participation of man in conversion, as in sanctification, is excluded. Synergism in every form, whether before or after conversion, is an error, since it destroys the true faith which is one continuous glori-

fication of the power of God and an admission that man can do nothing and foresee nothing. Such is the man whom some Methodists ignorantly hold up to us as a leader. May we be saved from this, as also from the opposite extreme.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

The German Protestant Association. Representing as it does the extreme left in German theological thought, its members would ordinarily be classed with our so-called freethinkers. But more and more they are coming to see, as are the Unitarians of America, that mere protests against existing conditions can furnish no firm basis for aggressive union. Hence, at the annual meeting of the Association, held in Hamburg, September 26–28, 1899, they emphasized the necessity for adding to their usual plea for liberty of thought and teaching positive, constructive activity, especially since in this lies the strength of Protestantism in contradistinction to the ecclesiasticism of Rome. Among the important resolutions adopted were the following: "1. The antithesis between the traditional doctrine of the Church and the modern view of the world can be overcome only by an entirely new statement of Christian doctrine in which frank recognition shall be given to all the truths of science. 2. We demand of the Church freedom to tell the truth; from theology strict conformity to the truth in her statements of Church doctrine; and from preachers the faithful proclamation of that which is recognized as fact. 3. Such freedom and truth will, in our judgment, secure the existence of the evangelical Church and preserve for her the confidence of the people." The only objection offered, and the principal objection which could be offered to these resolutions was that they appeared to intimate that any who do not hold the modern views are insincere and untruthful. When it was explained that the resolutions carried with them no such implication they were unanimously adopted, as they might be in any Methodist Conference. It is also noteworthy that the Association put itself unequivocally on record as denying the adequacy of the programme of the so-called ethical-culture movement which would do away with all dogma and which would place the ground of morality elsewhere than in God. On the whole the reported proceedings of the meeting indicate a more positive attitude than is generally attributed to the Association.

The Struggle for Social Purity in Germany. Americans are chary of discussing questions in public which our soberer and more earnest cousins of the Fatherland are not unwilling to bring to the front. In October, 1899, the General Conference for Social Purity met and reviewed the work of the preceding and planned for that of the coming year. The Conference numbers among its members university professors, physicians, and philanthropists, both male and female. It was announced that the university professors will issue a tract warning the students that all im-

purity threatens the health. The declaration was made that there are in Germany two hundred thousand women who depend upon unchastity for a livelihood. Some claimed that one of the great causes of social impurity in Germany is the one-sided intellectual aspect of education which neglects the development of character. The principle, also new for Germany, was announced, that there is but one morality for men and women. The white cross, similar to our white ribbon movement, was reported to have about seventeen thousand members. The close connection between the use of inoxicating drinks and unchastity, and the responsibility of women in the elevation of ethical ideals in the family and society were emphasized. The futility of attempting to check the evil by license was clearly proved and the heathenish character of such measures pointed out. The Conference declared that the only aid the state could afford was in repression, or, as we would call it, prohibition.

Ancient Theories of Immortality in India. From the earliest times, according to a recent writer in the *Indian Evangelical Review*, men in that eastern land have speculated about the future. The "venerable sages" there, our author tells us, "thought much about this question, as it presented itself on the banks of the sacred Ganges, and gave very clear expression to their cherished conviction of life after death, so that in the ancient strains of the hymns of the Rig-Veda we find distinct traces of belief in the continuation of life beyond the grave." Inviting us first to look at the Vedanta system, our writer speaks as follows: "It may be said that according to the Vedantists immortality of a kind follows from the very foundation principle of their system. The fundamental idea of this philosophy is that there is only one real being, and that this being is absolutely one. The famous aphorism which our theistic countrymen now adopt as enunciating the unity of the Godhead is the assumption on which Vedantism is based. As used by the Vedantists, it is charged with the pantheistic meaning that individual souls who seem to be distinct personalities are really so many finite manifestations of the universal spirit, Brahm. . . . Since there is really only one *Atman*, or spirit, though there are many minds who are used by the supreme *Atman* as its instruments, different men and women are all truly one, and, of course, the soul of man is immortal, as it is nothing other than the eternal Brahm, the only self-existent, eternal, and changeless one." Still another argument that the Hindu philosophers employed is that all composite things are eventually resolved "into their simple elements," but that the soul—as a simple substance, "above the laws of causality, time, and space"—will escape destruction. Another Hindu argument for immortality is based on the preexistence of the soul. Plato also gave this view a conspicuous place, and to his theories the latter part of the article from which we quote is largely devoted. Altogether, the paper—if it does not state truth particularly new—at least presents the old in an oriental and attractive setting.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

L. Marillier, of Paris, concludes in the November issue of *The International Monthly* (Burlington, Vt.) his scientific discussion of "Primitive Objects of Worship," which was begun in October, the trend and final effect of which may be inferred from a single sentence, "Thus fall at once the theories which make of religion an artificial or semiartificial creation, the conscious work of a priesthood, or a collection of symbols intentionally selected to be the brilliant and mysterious garb of a system of highly metaphysical or moral truths." Professor Sumner's paper on "The Predominant Issue," insists that the United States ought not only to grant independence, but to force it on Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and that this country should turn its attention to itself, and look for its safety and prosperity only in domestic development, peace, industry, free trade with everybody, low taxes, and industrial power. With this view we are unable to sympathize. An article which continues the homage offered to Ruskin since his death, is by John C. Lafarge, of New York, who writes, to be sure, far more in criticism than in homage, claiming to express the sentiments of the majority of those who paint anything of enduring value, and asserting that Ruskin's long and laborious work as a teacher in art has now no authority with artists. The trouble was that not being himself a practical artist he could not be a practical teacher. It is as an artist in words that he should most be magnified and valued. Lafarge quotes from the close of Ruskin's lectures on art, delivered before the University of Oxford in 1870, a passage in which the lecturer indicates the possible improvement which may come to art in consequence of its introduction among the studies of the university. He says that, in the past, art has not been thoughtful enough, great artists have been too exclusively craftsmen. "Many of the greatest pictures are enigmas; others, beautiful toys; others, harmful and corrupting toys. In the loveliest there is something weak; in the greatest there is something guilty." And then predicting better possibilities, he says, sanguinely: "This is the new thing that may come to pass—that the scholars of England may resolve to teach also with the powers of the arts; and that pictures may be painted which shall not be enigmas any more, but open teachings of what cannot otherwise be so well shown; which shall not be fevered or broken visions any more, but shall be filled with the indwelling light of self-possessed imagination; which shall not be stained or enfeebled any more by evil passions, but glorious with the strength and chastity of human love; and which shall no more degrade or disguise the work of God in heaven, but testify of Him as dwelling here with men, and walking with them, not angry, in the garden of the earth."

This prediction an artist regards as about as presumptuous and silly as if a teacher in literature should say to his university class, "This, O young gentlemen, is what will come to pass through our superiority over our predecessors; we shall so teach that works will be done through us, that neither the errors of Homer, nor the fevered and broken visions of Dante, nor the evil passions and lukewarm morality of Shakespeare shall stain or enfeeble, but which shall be glorious with the strength and chastity of noble human love." Professor F. H. Giddings contributes a wise paper on "Modern Sociology," and John W. Foster writes, from intimate knowledge, of the Chinese viceroy and diplomat, Li Hung Chang. This extraordinary man, now seventy-nine years old, is pure Chinese, having no Manchu blood in his veins. He was never out of his own country until his visit to Japan in 1895, and to Europe and America in 1896. Wu Ting-fang, the present Chinese minister at Washington, got his training in diplomacy as one of the viceroy's secretaries for many years, as he got his early education and his knowledge of English in the schools of the missionaries at Canton and Hongkong. When Li Hung Chang was in Japan, and an attempt to assassinate him came near succeeding, the Christians of Nagoya, both Japanese and foreign, sent a message saying they were praying for his recovery. His son sent the following reply: "My father is deeply moved by the solicitude you express for his welfare, and feels that the prayers you have offered cannot have been unheeded by the Power who controls human destinies. He believes that his life has been spared to him for some wise purpose beyond the capacity of man to fathom; but he will venture to interpret his almost miraculous escape as an indication that his lifework is not yet complete; that he may yet do some good in the world, and perhaps render service to his country by endeavoring to restore peace and good will where strife now prevails." While in New York in 1896 the viceroy fully acknowledged the useful labors of Christian missionaries in China and the duty of his government to afford them ample protection. And after his return to Peking he used this language to one of our Methodist bishops: "Ask the American people, for me, to send over more missionaries for the schools and hospitals, and I hope to be in a position both to aid and to protect them." Yet, after all, the missionaries feel that this astute diplomat may need to be watched in order to see whether he will live up to his professions.

In that sterling and unmeretricious magazine, *The Atlantic Monthly* (Boston), for December, twenty-two articles, in prose and verse, besides the discussions in The Contributors' Club, offer varied attractions. "The Story of a New England Town" is John Fiske's historical address at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of that most beautiful of college towns, Middletown, Conn. Of it the Harvard professor says: "In the very aspect of these broad, quiet streets,

with their arching trees, their dignified and hospitable, sometimes quaint, homesteads, we see the sweet domesticity of the old New England unimpaired. Nowhere is true worth of character more justly valued or more cordially welcomed, with small regard to mere conventional standards; and this I believe to be one of the surest marks of high civilization." Goldwin Smith writes of "War as a Moral Medicine," criticising and opposing Dean Farrar's article in the *North American Review*, which spoke of war as not only necessary for self-defense and for maintaining international police, but also as a moral tonic promotive of the health of nations and often an agency of human progress. Goldwin Smith thinks that to-day a revived love of war indicates a satiety of the gentle virtues of civilization and a reversion toward the brute passions and rages which befit barbarians; that Christianity, the religion of mild and philanthropic spirit, is declining in its influence over the conduct of nations, and that the physical view of man is ascendant over the moral and spiritual. He refers to a German philosopher, recently deceased, who frankly preached the gospel of force and held that the chief obstacle to progress is morality. He is of opinion that governments which believe themselves to be actuated by ideas about "manifest destiny," the "white man's burden," and the "mission of the Anglo-Saxon race" are led by those mystical fancies far away from the sober dictates of righteousness and humanity. Gerald Stanley Lee finds "The Dominance of the Crowd" manifest even in theology: "The measuring by numbers is found in all belief. Helpless individuals mastered by crowds are bound to believe in a kind of infinitely helpless God. He stands in the midst of the crowd of his laws and the systems of his worlds: to those who are not religious, a pale First Cause; and to those who are, a Great Sentimentality far away in the heavens, who, in a kind of vast weak-mindedness (a Puritan would say), seems to want everybody to be good and hopes they will be, but does not quite know what to do about it if they are not. . . . Every civilization has its typical idea of God. A civilization with sovereign men in it has a sovereign God; and a crowd civilization, reflecting its mood on the heavens, is inclined to a pleasant God, eternally considering everybody and everything, but inefficient withal." But he takes this turn presently: "If the One who called Himself a man and a God had not been born in a crowd, if He had not loved and grappled with crowds, if He had not been worshiped and crucified by crowds, He might have been a Redeemer for the silent, scattered, sparse, ancient world that was before He came, but He would have failed to be a Redeemer for this modern world—a world where the main inspiration and the main discouragement is the crowd, where every great problem and every great hope is one that deals with crowds." Henry L. Abbott writes of "The Best Isthmian Canal," which he forcibly argues must be by Panama and not by Nicaragua. Benjamin Ide Wheeler contributes an acute and needed paper on "Art in Language." He says that in this rattling day of

stenographers and typewriters we sadly "miss the restringent and demulcent influences of the old quill pen;" that, with present methods of education, the next generation will not know how to write or how to spell; that art is superior to the rationalizing intelligence, because the former seeks the vision which is face to face, while the latter knows in part, prophesies in part, and sees in a glass darkly. "Poetry is profounder than psychology, architecture than engineering, painting than the physics of color, literature than philology, faith than criticism; and though these sterner disciplines of the intelligence purge and chasten and correct, they are guideboards and not the way, precepts and not the truth, body and not the life. . . . The judgments of the intelligence judge with part of a soul. But taste abjures the minims and the millimeters, the fragmentary tests and the partial vision, looks full and straight with the whole of the soul, and judges with the whole of the life. The judgment of taste is more than the sum of all the judgments of reason, as home is more than the sum of the rooms of a house, life more than the sum of the members of a body, communion with God more than the sum of all the doctrines. . . . Teaching that imparts knowledge, and fails to supply ideals and inspiration, is notably not education; craft that fires no yearning for the vision of the greater whole is not art. A rift in the veil, a glimpse of that other fair land where the best that is in us divines itself native—that alone is the handiwork and yield of art. . . . The effect of suitable language will always be measured among civilized communities, not by its precise report of concepts and propositions after the manner of algebraic formulæ and equations, but by the spiritual atmosphere of thousandfold suggestion and association which it brings in with it, like the breath of a larger life to quicken the dry bones—the dry bones which lie in the narrow valley of the matter-of-fact. Our response to the forms of verse and the gentle touch of poetry has place among the intimations of immortality. We know that we have part in the larger life, because there is that within us which is more than can be said. . . . The quest for the ideal and the instinct of form are close akin. Form in art, form in literature, form in manners, form in devotion, all are born of one human instinct and desire—the desire to see the common everyday life and its materials now and again dignified to the service of some higher purpose, to participation in some greater plan of the greater whole."

Superlatively doleful in its spirit is Frederic Harrison's funeral wail in the *North American Review* (New York) for December, 1900, over the circumstances which attend the closing of the old year. His article is entitled "Christianity at the Grave of the Nineteenth Century," and, while having primarily to do with conditions that obtain in England, yet discusses principles which are general in their application. "Our immediate generation"—so the author records his conviction—"has

been sinking of late to meaner ideals, to coarser ways of life, to more vulgar types of literature and art, to more open craving after wealth, and a more insolent assertion of pride and force." The causes of the "general debasement of tone" Mr. Harrison regards as "partly material and partly spiritual." The change for the worse began with "the triumph of the Bismarckian policy, by which the map of Europe was transformed thirty years ago." The previous European wars, following the fall of Napoleon, "had all been professedly waged to protect some people from oppression, for defense against aggression, not of avowed offense and conquest." But Bismarck set a new fashion in statesmanship, and did not lack for imitators and rivals. "Russia, from whom perhaps the famous chancellor originally imported his great idea, had an irresistible destiny in that direction, as the largest, most populous, least civilized nation in Europe. Austria, even, added to all her difficulties by another big annexation in the Balkan peninsula. Italy, in spite of her bankruptcy and dynastic weakness, must needs clutch at a province on the Red Sea. France could not be left out, and must make the tricolor wave over part of Siam, Tonquin, Madagascar, the Niger, and at last the Nile. Japan, and even little Greece, took up the imperial mania. And at last the United States forsook their settled rules and policy, and are starting an empire across the ocean." All this has been followed by "gigantic speculations," started "in all parts of the planet," and the effects on the intellectual life of the nation have been degrading. "Compare the early part and the middle of the reign of the queen with the last two or three decades. Who will dare to say that its close can compare with its promise—in poetry, in romance, in literature, in philosophy, or in science? . . . Names will occur to all—Dr. Arnold and his son, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning, Macaulay, Carlyle, Thackeray, Dickens, Bulwer, Disraeli, Hallam, Milman, Freeman, Froude, Ruskin, the Brontës, George Eliot, Kingsley, Trollope. All the work, or all the best and permanent work, of these was completed and had passed into the fabric of English literature before the imperialist era began, some twenty-five years ago. Have their successors quite equaled them?" The same fact, also, the author finds to hold in philosophy, sociology, and pure science. Intellectual and æsthetic aims have become "gross and materialized." The drama "runs not merely to vice, but to morbid, sneaking forms of vice. . . . Popular novels, songs, and plays are composed in the jargon current amongst costermongers and thieves. Romance tends to vignettes of sensationalism, to the more cancerous forms of debauchery, and to prurient maunderings over sex problems." Furthermore, Mr. Harrison finds spiritual and intellectual causes, as well as material, for the deterioration. The philosophy "of evolution and of logical demonstration" has not performed what it promised. "It claimed to explain the world and to direct man. But it left a great blank. That blank was the whole field of religion, of morality, of the sanctions of duty. It left the mystery of the future as mysterious as

ever, and yet as imperative as ever. Whatever philosophy of nature it offered, it gave no adequate philosophy of man. It was busy with physiology of humanity; it propounded inconceivable and repulsive guesses about the origin of humanity." From the hesitations and doubts of such leaders as Darwin, Mill, and Spencer there followed a "general discredit to the entire philosophy of evolution and the entire theology of neo-Christianity." Nor does the writer find encouragement in the religious situation of the day, as the new century dawns. It is true that the Churches were never more "in evidence" than at the present. "Their pretensions were never higher; their rolls never fuller; their patrons never more illustrious." But, continues Mr. Harrison, "is vital religion more general, more effective? Is genuine belief in the creeds more definite and clear? Is Christianity more truly a civilizing, a moralizing force? Who will dare say so? . . . We have been dwelling to-day on the evil things in our modern life, on the chase after money, the rampant love of gambling, the extravagance, the coarseness, the materialistic spirit growing on all sides. What have the Churches done to purify and check all this? Who would care if they did try? Who would believe them in earnest in doing so?" Not a voice comes from the official churches of England in challenge of the justice, good faith, and Christian charity of those who wage the "wanton war of spoliation" in South Africa. "At home our own preparation for war is sounded in slang from drinking saloons, which is echoed back in pale and conventional litanies from the altars of the State Church. This is how Christianity works out in practice at the close of the nineteenth century." Under such gloomy conditions—in the estimate of Mr. Harrison—the world moves out of the old era into the new.

The Critical Review (London) for November, 1900, is weighty, as usual, with critical reviews of numerous books. We quote a part of its notice of the thirtieth Fernley lecture, delivered in Burslem last July by Dr. Charles Joseph Little, President of Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.: "It is now published under the title of *Christianity and the Nineteenth Century*. It begins with a somewhat rapid sketch of the Christianity of the czar, the pope, and the people, and then passes on to deal with the Christianity of experience, and what the author describes as the Leaven and the Lump. The lecturer carries us with him and never lets the interest flag. . . . His estimate of the meaning and power of the Reformation is one of the best things in the book. 'The hidden root of the Reformation,' he says, 'was and is the attainment and paramount authority of a living experience of Christ in the soul of the believer.' As to the theology of the Reformation, he rightly claims that, 'like the mechanics of Galileo, it started from experience.' And in well-chosen words he points out how soon theology became something different from that, and what it might have been with us now if it had kept true to its beginnings." The brief discussion of Professor Harnack's lectures, given

last winter at the University of Berlin, on the *Essence of Christianity*, is discriminating in withholding approval of certain views and positions while admitting that portions of the lectures may be helpful to some minds disconcerted and in difficulty with regard to the claims and meaning of the religion of Jesus Christ. To us Harnack's views as to the biblical miracles are extremely unsatisfactory, even though he does not peremptorily reject miracle, and in one place says that the religious man cannot help believing that "the course of nature serves higher ends, and that, by means of an inner divine force, it may be so used that everything shall serve the best." Harnack founds his interpretation of the essence and meaning of Christianity on the Synoptical Gospels alone, and holds the Gospel which they teach to be a very simple thing—a moral message, which stands apart at once from dogma, external Pharisaic rules, and social programmes—a Gospel within the Gospel, which makes love to God and to man the one ground for all action. The better part of the lectures may be inferred from the following words: "What Harnack recognizes as true is that Christ knew Himself to be Messiah, and to have the Father with Him and in Him. And the essence of His work is declared to be this—the impartation to men of that living conviction of the Fatherhood of God which He Himself had. What Christ did was to deliver a message to men which had three circles of ideas, namely, first, the kingdom of God and its coming; secondly, God the Father and the infinite value of the soul of man; and thirdly, higher righteousness and the law of love. His message, therefore, is entirely moral, in no sense dogmatic." Dr. James H. Rigg's *Oxford High Anglicism and Its Leaders*, written from the view-point of Wesleyan Evangelical faith, now in its second edition, is recognized as "an important contribution to the study of a chapter in the ecclesiastical history of England, which is likely long to retain its interest." A review of more than usual force and interest is that by E. H. Blakeney of Dr. J. H. Stirling's large octavo, *What is Thought? The Problem of Philosophy by Way of a General Conclusion*, in which a sort of critical parenthesis is this: "Chapter V., 'Philosophy and Science,' is one of the most impressive chapters in the book. And there we may conveniently note one peculiar characteristic of Dr. Stirling's writing, and that is his *instantaneously solemnizing* power. He will be dealing, say, some shrewd hits at Kant's system; or gibing at some idle piece of rationalism more than usually redolent of the new Aufklärung; or girding himself to do battle with some fallacy, tossing his opponents to and fro, as he heaps scorn upon solemn quackery, whether canonized by Aufgeklärter or not—and then, suddenly (and in this he reminds one of the poet Browning), his words shape themselves into noble order, and a strange sense of harmony, as of some cosmic hymn, breathes through each syllable, making itself felt in living power of spiritual conviction."

BOOK NOTICES.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

The Age of Faith. By AMORY H. BRADFORD, D.D. 12mo, pp. 306. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, $1.50.

Henry Van Dyke called this an age of doubt, and published a book to show the Gospel's adaptation to such an age. This author describes the same age as one of faith, a time of moral earnestness, and eagerness to believe whatever is approved by the intelligence and the conscience, and thinks that the subjects most needing emphasis in such a time are the Personality of God, the Fatherhood of God, and the fact that all theories about God, man, and the universe should be interpreted in the light of the Fatherhood. These furnish a sure basis for optimism; they show that the brotherhood of man is universal and vital; that suffering and sorrow are means in the hands of love for the perfecting of human character, and indispensable to human progress; that sin is an incident in the upward movement of the race, not necessary, but always possible; that salvation is the sure purpose of omnipotent love; that prayer is the natural and necessary intercourse between parent and child; that what is called punishment is always disciplinary and intended to restore; and that the deathless life follows of necessity, because man is of the same nature as God, and, therefore, must partake of His immortality. But all human interpretations would be fallible and uncertain, however true the principle on which they were based, unless there was an infallible guide. That infallible guide Jesus promised, and the ages are realizing, in the person of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, who will lead into all truth and show things to come. Christians are disciples of the Spirit of Truth, and they wait reverently and expectantly for the disclosures of the future, while they honor and trust the revelations of the past. These are some of the truths which Dr. Bradford believes and emphasizes. The motto of his book may be said to be, "Interpret God by His Fatherhood." Declaring this to be preeminently an age of faith, it must be confessed even by the despondent, that he comes very near to making his statement good, while the more hopeful will feel that he is solidly and firmly right in his thesis and in his proofs. As for science, he shows that it cultivates faith, not doubt. The scientist is of necessity a man of faith. He searches for something in which he believes, although for him, when he begins, the object of his quest has only imaginary existence. Faith, as an intellectual attitude, is the same whether it affirms the law of evolution or the being of God. Darwin used faith as truly as Paul. They had the same mental attitude, although their minds were directed to different objects. An astronomer turns his telescope toward some part of the heavens, not because he has

ever seen a planet in that field, but because the perturbations of another planet have led him to believe that if he searches long enough there his efforts will be rewarded. Science is the affirmation by faith of an undiscovered but discernible reality. Dr. Bradford points out that the proportion of men of science who are deeply religious is very large. "In the British Scientific Association the Christian members maintain a daily prayer meeting. Lord Kelvin is an elder in a Scotch Presbyterian Church; Professor Young, the Princeton astronomer, is, or was, a Presbyterian elder. George J. Romanes, after long wandering in the deserts of agnosticism, came back to a child's faith. Agassiz was a devout believer in God. John L. Gulick, who in the opinion of Romanes has made more original contributions to the doctrine of evolution than any scientist after Darwin, is a missionary of the American Board in Japan. Sir William Dawson finds a divine revelation in the rocks. Asa Gray, the botanist, used to delight in saying that he was a believer in evolution and in the Nicene Creed. Few books have done more to strengthen faith in immortality than the *Unseen Universe*, the joint work of Professors Tate and Balfour Stuart. Henry Drummond was both a professor of physical science and an evangelist. If this is an age of science, it is of necessity an age of faith, since the scientist trusts his own intellectual faculties and processes, which is one act of faith, and believes in a reality behind phenomena, which is another act of faith." In literature, also, the author shows that, while skeptics are prominent, yet faith is a marked characteristic of the age. "Zola, Paul Bourget, and Brunetière in France may be skeptics; John Morley, Frederic Harrison, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and Thomas Hardy, to say nothing of Matthew Arnold and George Eliot, may be agnostics, although some of of them would repudiate the title. The Scottish school of fiction is just now most prominent in the literature of the English-speaking world. MacDonald, Stevenson, Barrie, Crockett, Ian Maclaren, all are known as devout believers. The fact that no novels are so popular as those which treat of religious subjects shows where the hearts of the people are. . . . The most potent and enduring literary force in Europe is Tolstoi, a man with the courage of a warrior and the vision of a prophet, who has penetrated deeply into the heart of human life, and found that character is the sublimest thing of which an author can write." As to the poets, our author shows that the greatest voices utter no uncertain sound. Who that remembers what Browning, Tennyson, Lowell, Whittier, Sidney Lanier, and Richard Watson Gilder have written can call this an age of doubt? As a typical utterance of our time Robert Louis Stevenson's Sunday evening prayer, which he wrote in Samoa, is quoted: "We beseech Thee, Lord, to behold us with favor, folk of many families and nations, gathered together in the peace of this roof; weak men and women subsisting under the covert of Thy patience. Be patient still; suffer us a while longer with our broken purposes of good, with our idle endeavors against evil—suffer us a while longer to endure and

(if it may be) help us to do better. Bless to us our extraordinary mercies; if the day come when they must be taken, brace us to play the man under affliction. Be with our friends, be with ourselves. Go with each of us to rest; if any wake, temper to them the dark hours of watching; and when the day returns, return to us our sun and comforter, call us with morning faces, eager to labor, eager to be happy, if happiness shall be our portion, and, if the day be marked for sorrow, strong to endure it. We thank Thee, and praise Thee, and, in the words of Him to whom this day is sacred, close our oblation." Dr. Bradford endeavors to show that the study of comparative religion, the Chicago World's Parliament of Religions, the study of the Bible by what is called criticism, low or high, the new movement in theology, the very fads of the day, like faith healing, Christian science, and the rest, and the crusade of charity and widespread activity of Christian philanthropic agencies, all illustrate and promote the power of faith. He says that the Gospel needed by this age, a Gospel which makes life worth living and rings the knell of pessimism, must begin and end in the revelation of God, who in all the eternities and infinities, in His dealings with this world and all worlds, is truly made known in Jesus Christ, who, in His earthly life, His unwearying service, His matchless teaching, His self-sacrificing death, and His victory over the grave, was "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person." This glorious Gospel is interpreted in this optimistic book and presented as the only rational basis and warrant for optimism. The range and order of the thought are indicated by the chapter headings: "The Age of Faith," "The Conception of God," "God Interpreted by Fatherhood," "The Basis of Optimism," "Brotherhood," "Suffering and Sorrow," "Sin," "Salvation," "Prayer," "Punishment or Discipline," "The Immortal Life," "The Teacher for All Ages." We commend *The Age of Faith* as a stimulating, confirming, and heartening book for all, especially for such as have yielded to gloomy views about the state and prospects of the Church and the world. It is a bracing and most wholesome tonic. We have had of late altogether too much wailing, and lamenting, and despondency in Christian, and even in Methodist, circles. We stoutly affirm that there has been no sufficient and justifying cause for it. Let Mr. Faint-heart keep still, and no longer infect and dispirit the body with his own timidity. Let those have the floor whose souls are brave with courage, buoyant with confidence, mighty with faith in God and in the sure, swift, victory of Jesus Christ.

Character and Characteristics of William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic. Selected and Arranged with an Introduction. By ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D., of St. George's Free Church, Edinburgh. 8vo, pp. 329. London: Hodder & Stoughton. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Price, cloth, $1.50.

What would be the result if one should, for a year, exclude from his mind the miscellaneous flood of light, unseasoned literature pouring from the contemporary press, and shut himself up with an incomparable

old writer like William Law, cannot be precisely guessed; but that twelvemonth would surely be an intellectual and spiritual epoch in one's life. Many well-read men have not read a single line of this great thinker. Yet it is truly said that there is possibly no author in English literature whose works will better delight and reward readers of an original or serious cast of mind than those of Law. To make a volume of selections from the larger mass is not easy, for he is called the most *continuous* writer in the English language. But such a volume is of extraordinary value, because in sheer intellectual strength and brilliancy he ranks with the foremost of his illustrious contemporaries—De Foe, Pope, Addison, Goldsmith, Bishop Butler, Southey, and the rest—while in that fertilizing touch, which is the true test and token of genius, he simply stands supreme and alone. One has said that Canon Mozley at his best would be not unlike Law if there were added to Mozley's style a dash of J. H. Newman to give lucidity, keenness, flexibility, with here and there a subtle touch of wit and satire. Law was one of the mightiest of all polemical writers. An early exercise of this power was his refutation of the abominable doctrines put forth by Mandeville in *The Fable of the Bees*, which taught that the vilest and most diabolical vices are not only natural to man, but necessary to fit him for his life in this world. This book, so cynical and insulting toward virtue, evoked many indignant replies, but none to compare with Law's. Even Gibbon confessed that morality and religion must unite in applauding Law's overwhelming onslaught against Mandeville's licentious doctrines. It is a masterly piece of philosophical polemic, red-hot with passionate indignation and tempestuous with moral fury, showing how human virtue has its origin and seat in the divine virtue; how obligation arises in the reason and conscience of man; how our human idea of God is formed; how and what happiness is the perfection of human nature; and how our liberty and our conduct act upon the formation of character, and on our ultimate desert and destiny—making a treatise which is an essay in moral philosophy and a gem in literature, such as fills the reader's heart with joy. Mandeville was a powerful writer, who saw the seamy side of life, and saw some seams and creases and stains and scars which existed only in his own polluted imagination and corrupt heart. Law's two most famous productions are *A Serious Call to a Holy Life* and *A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection.* In the latter he bottoms his book deep in the nature of fallen man, in the nature of sin, and in the nature and design of true religion; and works up from all that to the very highest attainments of Christian experience, and out from all that to the finest fulfillments of Christian obedience. He takes us into a strait gate and along a narrow way, but every step rewards us with new liberty and a nobler prospect, till he lands us at last without spot or blemish before the throne of God. When John Wesley complained that Law's doctrine of Christian perfection was too high to be attainable, Law replied, "We shall do well to aim at the highest degree

of perfection if we may thereby at least attain to mediocrity." Of the painful quarrel that afterward broke out between Wesley and Law, Dr. Whyte says: "The ins and outs of this dispute are set forth with impartiality both by Tyerman in his *Life of Wesley*, and by Canon Overton in his *Life of Law*. It is refreshing and reassuring, and reads us an excellent lesson, to see how Tyerman holds that Wesley was in the wrong, and Overton that Law was wrong. Both biographers show that Wesley's attack on his old oracle and master was inevitable, given the man and given the great change he passed through after he had taken Peter Böhler to be his new master. But it is not the less to be deplored that the two best and most influential men of that whole century should have afforded such a display of acrimony and recrimination. A part, if not the whole, of that controversy lay in this—that Law and Wesley were perhaps as different as two able and good men could well be. Wesley was fitted to be a popular and most impressive preacher, while Law was never allowed to preach, but was early set apart by divine Providence to think, and read, and write. The work of Wesley's life was to preach awakening sermons, whereas Law's equally divine commission was to take already converted men, especially the intellectual and educated, and compel them to a more consecrated life. And surely, if they could only both have seen it, there was ample scope and call enough within the lines of evangelical Christianity for two such signally gifted if singularly individual men. We see now that one of these extraordinary men without the other would have left the religious life and literature of the eighteenth century weak, one-sided, and unsafe. Could they but have seen it, both were indispensable—Wesley to complete Law, and Law to complete Wesley. Even after their long quarrel Wesley said of Law's *Serious Call*, 'It will hardly be excelled, if it be equaled, in the English tongue, either for beauty of expression or for justness and depth of thought. It must remain as long as England endures, an almost unequaled standard of the strength and purity of our language as well as of sound practical divinity.' Dr Johnson, at Oxford, took it up, expecting to find it dull and perhaps to laugh at it, but found it quite an overmatch for him, so that it set him to thinking in earnest, for the first time, about religion; and he called it the finest piece of hortatory theology in any language. Gibbon said of the *Serious Call*, 'It is a powerful book; and many of its portraits are worthy the pen of La Bruyère.' While in our own time, Augustine Birrell, speaking of Gibbon, says, 'Splendid achievement of learning and industry though the *Decline and Fall* may be, glorious monument though it is, more lasting than marble, yet in sundry moods it seems but a poor and barren thing by the side of a book which, like the *Serious Call*, has proved its power to pierce the heart and tame the will.'" Concerning the production by Law of two golden books in the latter part of his life, the following is written: "Sir James Mackintosh has adduced the memorable instances of Cicero and Milton and Dryden

and Burke in support of his idea that there is some natural tendency in the fire of genius to burn more brightly in the evening than in the morning of human life. This was signally the case with William Law. His seraphic genius blazed up to heaven in the evening of his holy life, till we cannot take up *The Spirit of Prayer* or *The Spirit of Love* into our hands without feeling that we are in the presence of a man whose heart was an absolute altar-fire." Law testified that it was Jacob Behmen, the poor unlettered German shoemaker, who taught him his deepest knowledge of the spiritual life. Thus Behmen took up one of the greatest theologians and practical writers of the eighteenth century and made him the greatest of English mystics. A sample of Law's shrewd portraits in his book on Christian perfection is this: "Patronus is fond of a clergyman that understands music, painting, architecture, and statuary. He is an enemy to the dissenters, and loves the Church of England because of the stateliness and beauty of its buildings; he never comes to the sacrament, but will go forty miles to see a fine altarpiece. He goes to church when there is a new tune to be heard, but never had any more serious thoughts about salvation than about flying. If you visit him when he is dying, you will hear his dying thoughts about architecture." Law died in 1761, aged seventy-five. The volume before us contains pithy extracts from his various works, forty-eight from the *Characteristics*, eleven from *Christian Perfection*, and twenty from the *Serious Call.*

Christian Life and Theology. By FRANK HUGH FOSTER, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Theology in the Pacific Theological Seminary. 12mo, pp. 286. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, $1.50.

The precise subject of this book is the contribution of Christian experience to the system of evangelical doctrine. Its chapters are the Stone Lectures for 1900, at Princeton Theological Seminary. As to its aim, Professor Foster says in his preface: "It has not been my intention to advocate experience as a substitute for the Scriptures as a source of Christian doctrine, or to make it the primary source. Personally I prefer the experiential method of introducing the study of Systematic Theology, and employ it in my own instruction as, upon the whole, the best; but I do not deny that other methods of approach are legitimate, nor that they have certain advantages which must be surrendered to gain the greater advantages of the experiential approach. What I have positively sought to do is to promote the accurate study of Christian experience. Under the name of Christian consciousness it has received great attention in recent years, but most of what has been said about it has been so careless and vague as to be of little value. It should be treated with accuracy, as it may be. Two incidental services I have sought to render: 1. One is the development, in a new form, of the old Protestant argument for the Scriptures from the 'Testimony of the Spirit.' It is, I believe, an argument particularly suited to meet the difficulties of the present day. I call attention to it in order to solicit searching examination of its validity and scope. If it can be invalidated, this will be a service to Christian

thinking. If it cannot, it will remain a bulwark of faith in the questionings of our day. 2. Then again, I have sought to secure by theoretical discussion, and to exhibit by practical examples, the true place of Church history in the determination of the voice of experience. The results of a critical history of doctrine have their place among the materials of Christian doctrine. The current histories of doctrine do not seem to be aware, for the most part, that there are any such things as 'results' of their work; and few, if any, modern attempts to construct systems of doctrine make any distinct use of historical materials. Even Principal Fairbairn in his great book, admirably furnished as he is with historical knowledge, has been unable in the constructive part of his work to use the materials he has collected and himself augmented in the historical part. But the history of Christian doctrine should not be a collection of mere annals; it should be a genetic history tracing the true development of the Christian system; and its results ought not to be a collection of learned lumber, but materials for assisting men and ascertaining the mind of the Spirit and the truth of God. Thomasius remains almost alone as an historian of the higher aspects of Christian doctrine. He ought to have a successor who could in our day take the additional material brought together by the labors of Harnack and his school and draw the lessons of history in a form to be used by the Christian thinker." Substituting Christian experience for traditional scholasticism as a base line, and sympathizing with the intention of the German evangelical school, represented by Schleiermacher, Thomasius, Frank, Ritschl, and Kaftan, he goes beyond them all in basing theology directly on Christian life, or what he calls "the rich treasure of accumulated Christian experience of nineteen centuries." The fundamental principle of Christian experience is faith, which our author defines as "*the permanent choice of duty as such.*" In his chapter on "The New Birth" he elucidates and illuminates this with remarkable clearness, simplicity, and convincingness—a practically valuable chapter it is for the minister, the teacher, the convert, or the penitent. We wish we had room for the whole chapter. The attempt is made by careful analysis to bring out the things involved in that ultimate fact of Christian experience, the new birth. In the introductory chapter it is written: "Faith is a mystery to most Christians and a greater mystery to other men. . . . It may be simple, abiding trust, repose of the soul, submission to the care of a perfect Redeemer, the attitude of passive receptivity; or it may be enlistment in a service, as when a warrior girds on his arms and takes his place with firm purpose amid the dangers and terrors of battle. It is like a seed thrown into the earth, capable of growth, producing deeper thoughts, a more enlarged horizon of life and duty, warmer feelings, more profound resolutions, longer and more consistent trains of action. But as faith is the ultimate thing in the Christian life, so it is ultimately one thing, which given, all the rest will develop, which wanting, nothing else can flourish. *It is the permanent choice of duty*

as duty. Jesus calls to *duty* embracing both God and man; and conscience affirms obligation and ultimately defines it in the same way. Man in response must take the right attitude toward obligatory duty. When he does, the mental gaze, fixed steadily upon it by conscious effort, acquires new knowledge of its abstract relations and concrete contents. Thus the intellect is enriched. But more, the affections are enriched, for they cannot fail to be stirred by the contemplation of the chosen object, so that duty becomes the center about which gather deep feelings of devotion. Duty cannot omit the relations which we sustain to our Chief Teacher in holy things, and thus the attitude of trust in the Redeemer develops from it." This the author takes to be the core of true Christian experience, apart from all doctrines as to what precedes, environs, follows after, or relates to it. His argument proceeds upon the following facts as a basis. 1. The actuality of a distinctive Christian experience in the world. 2. The new birth as the central and ultimate fact in the Christian life, defined to be, on its human and experiential side, the supreme choice of duty as such. 3. The supremacy of obligation and of the moral faculties in man. 4. The idea of duty conveys and confirms the principle of responsibility. 5. The fact of sin—that is, of failure to obey conscience and perform duty—creates guilt, or liability to moral self-condemnation. 6. Sin is universal in humanity and unrelieved by any personal holiness. 7. The world, as the seat of universal sin, is a kingdom of evil, and lost. At the end of these scholarly, earnest, and intensely practical lectures Professor Foster expresses the hope that two main positions have been clearly established in the estimation of hearers and readers, whatever dissent there may be as to minor matters and mere details. 1. Christian experience is capable of logical analysis and of rigorously scientific treatment. 2. Thus analyzed Christian experience speaks for the system of evangelical doctrine believed in substance by all the great Churches which base their theology upon the Bible. Two great questions present themselves to future investigators and scholars for solution: 1. What particular doctrines are in fact associated in the experience of the Christian Church with genuine, pervasive, and active piety? 2. What precisely is it in those doctrines which actually elicits and promotes this ascertained piety? This book on its side, along with those of E. D. Starbuck and Professor George A. Coe on their side, gives evidence of the intentness and avidity with which our age is concentrating its efforts upon the investigation and interpretation of the facts of Christian experience. The sources and course of the Nile were never so earnestly searched for. Even if a complete rationale of religious experience may not soon be obtained and agreed upon, the search will be endless, for the seeker is immortal. As to Methodism's share in this momentous investigation, the fact of history is that no other communion has laid such emphasis on religious experience or devoted so much attention to its analysis and interpretation.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Complete Poetical Works of Elizabeth Barrett Browning. Crown 8vo, pp. 530. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, $2.

This is the eleventh of the volumes of the Cambridge Edition of the Poets, the works of each poet being complete in one volume. Each volume contains a portrait of the author, a full biographical sketch, and all necessary notes, with indexes to titles and first lines. The complete works of Longfellow, Whittier, Holmes, Lowell, Robert Browning, Burns, Tennyson, Milton, Keats, Sir Walter Scott, in one volume, are already issued; Shelley, Byron, and others are to come. Miss Elizabeth Barrett, while making that translation of the *Prometheus Bound* of Æschylus which was published in 1850, conceived the idea of her poem, "The Seraphim," which was the first original work of hers that obtained general recognition. In her preface to that poem she says, "I thought that, had Æschylus lived after the incarnation and crucifixion of our Lord Jesus Christ, he might have turned in poetic faith from the solitudes of Caucasus to the deeper desertness of that crowded Jerusalem where none had any pity, to the rent rocks and darkened sun, to the Victim whose sustaining thought beneath an unexampled agony was not the Titanic, 'I can revenge,' but the celestial, 'I can forgive!'" "Aurora Leigh," Mrs. Browning's longest poem, is, in its main purport, frankly socialistic, and was begun under the immediate impulse of studies in the works of Louis Blanc, Proudhon, and similar theorists. It was, on its publication, demurred to by Thackeray, fiercely condemned by Edward Fitzgerald, and called by Ruskin "the finest poem written in any language in this century." Her "Sonnets from the Portuguese" are, and are likely to remain, matchless among the poetic utterances of woman's love to man. In "Aurora Leigh" the eye catches many passages which fixed themselves in our memory long ago, such as:

> You who keep account of crisis and transition in this life,
> Set down the first time Nature says plain "No"
> To some "Yes" in you, and walks over you
> In gorgeous sweeps of scorn. We all begin
> By singing with the birds, and running fast
> With June days, hand in hand: but once, for all,
> The birds must sing against us, and the sun
> Strike down upon us like a friend's sword caught
> By an enemy to slay us, while we read
> The dear name on the blade which bites at us!—
> That's bitter and convincing: after that,
> We seldom doubt that something in the large
> Smooth order of creation, though no more
> Than haply a man's footstep, has gone wrong.

In her girlhood Elizabeth Barrett read the Greek Fathers in the original, under the guidance of the blind scholar, Hugh Stuart Boyd, who could repeat from memory whole pages of their works in prose and verse; and she wrote a series of papers for the *Athenæum* on the Greek Christian poets. Those papers are given us in the Appendix of this volume,

and will be new to many long familiar with her poems. Speaking of the yearning of the Greek Christian poets to write true religious poetry, she says: "Of religious poets, strictly speaking, the earth is very bare. Religious 'parcel-poets' we have, indeed, more than enough: writers of hymns, translators of Scripture into prose, or into rhymes, whose heart-devotion was worthy of a higher faculty. Also there have been poets, not a few, singing as if earth were still Eden; and poets, many, singing as if in the first hour of exile, when the echo of the curse was louder than the whisper of the promise. But the right 'genius of Christianism' has done little up to this moment (1842) even for Chateaubriand. We want the touch of Christ's hand upon our literature, as it touched other dead things—we want the sense of the saturation of Christ's blood upon the souls of our poets, that it may cry *through* them in answer to the ceaseless wail of the sphinx of our humanity, expounding agony into renovation." Of Gregory Nazianzen as an orator, Miss Barrett wrote: "He was not excellent at an artful blowing of the pipes. He spoke grandly, as the wind does, in gusts; and, as in a mighty wind, which combines unequal noises, the creaking of trees and rude swinging of doors as well as the sublime sovereign rush along the valleys, we gather the idea, from his eloquence, less of music than of power. Not that he is cold as the wind is—Gregory cannot be cold. He is various in his oratory, full and rapid in allusion, briefly graphic in metaphor, equally sufficient for indignation or pathos, and gifted peradventure with a keener dagger of sarcasm than should hang at a saint's girdle." Of George Pisida, who lived early in the seventh century, the following is written: "He knew the secret of beauty, and, having noble thoughts, could utter them nobly. But he is unequal; often coldly perplexed when he means to be ingenious, and violent when he seeks to be inspired. He premeditates ecstasies, and is inclined to the attitudes of orators; and he not only sleeps sometimes, but snores." About John of Euchaita we read this: "He was a bishop, but is only a poet now; and we turn to see the voice which speaks to us. It is a voice with a soul in it, clear and sweet and living: and we, who have walked long through desert centuries, leap up to its sound as to the dim flowing of a stream, and would take a deep breath by its side both for the weariness which is gone and the repose which is coming. But it is a rarer thing than a stream in the desert; it is a voice in the desert—the only sound remaining of a city denuded of its multitudes and ruined even of its ruins—a city so deserted and forgotten that the foxes have lost the way to it and the bittern's cry disturbs not the silence of its tombs. Only this Voice remains—one speechful voice, the effluence of the soul of John Mauropas replacing the bittern's cry." John Tzetza's name in the middle of the twelfth century is not a great one. He wrote in meter about crocodiles and flies, Plato's philosophy and Cleopatra's nails, Samson and Phidias, the Caledonian boar and the resurrection from the dead. But as to Poetry, Miss Barrett wrote, "There is

no apparent consciousness of such an entity in the mind of this versifier, no aspiration toward her presence, not so much as a sigh upon her absence. In Tzetza's work there is no unfolding of faculty; its general level is a dull talkativeness and a slumberousness without a dream." After him is mentioned Manuel Phile in the fourteenth century, and then Miss Barrett fancies her readers saying to her, "Now we have watched out the whole night of the world with you, by no better light than these poetical rushlights, and they fail, and the clock is near upon the stroke of the seventeenth century, and surely you have done." But she finds one more name to notice, Maximus Margunius, of Crete. From one of his hymns she quotes:

I, Saviour, am Thy bird,
Pecking with an open beak
At the words that Thou dost speak!
Leave a breath upon my wings,
That above these nether things
I may rise to where Thou art,—
I may flutter next Thy heart!
For if a light within me burn,
It must be darkness in an urn
Unless, within its crystalline,
That unbeginning light of Thine
Shine. O Saviour, *let* it shine!

And then she writes: "He is the last of our Greeks. The light from Troy city with which all Greek glory began shone into the heart of Greece. The light from Greece kindled beacons onward far along the ridges of time. We have watched them along the cloudy tops of the great centuries, through ages which were dark but for them; and now we stand looking with eyes of farewell upon the last pale sign on the last mist-bound hill. But it is the sixteenth century, and a new light is breaking; above the falling of the dew a great sun is rising; there is a rushing of life and song upward. Shakespeare is in the world! And the Genius of English Poetry, she who alone of all the earth is worthy (Goethe's spirit may hear us say so, and smile), stooping, with a royal gesture, to kiss the dead lips of the Genius of Greece, stands up as her successor in the universe, by virtue of that chrism and in right of her own crown." The history of the human race thus far leaves Elizabeth Barrett Browning supreme among women poets.

Studies and Appreciations. By LEWIS E. GATES. 12mo, pp. 234. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $1.50.

It is not long since we noticed this author's *Three Studies in Literature*, which was a luminous treatment of Francis Jeffrey, the brilliant reviewer; Cardinal Newman, the spiritual rhetorician; and Matthew Arnold, the humanistic critic. The present volume makes a welcome for itself by the same obvious mastery of subjects as its predecessor. The ten chapters give fresh and sparkling treatment of the following themes: "The Romantic Movement," "The Return to Conventional Life," "Tennyson's Relation to Common Life," "Nature in Tennyson's Poetry," "Haw-

thorne," "Edgar Allan Poe," "Charlotte Brontë," "Three Lyrical Modes," "Taine's Influence as a Critic," "Impressionism and Appreciation." One fault we are compelled to mention; the book should have an index. Of freshest interest is the characterization of three most recent newcomers of note into English verse, William Watson, Francis Thompson, and John Davidson. Of Watson it is said that his spirit, like Matthew Arnold's, is Wordsworthian, that his welcome has been large among officials and academic "people of importance," and that the London *Spectator* claims his right to rank with the greatest English poets. In his work as a poet Professor Gates finds much undeniable beauty, but a disappointing quality which he attributes to his excessive subservience to tradition and precedent, saying: "He has subjected a by no means powerful genius to a training and discipline that have brought him exquisite sureness of taste and deftness of technique, but have failed to develop real richness of nature or any novel or distinctive envisagement of life. He is too much of a poetic sacerdotalist; his authenticity has been his ruin; he is vaingloriously traditional; he has the ideal temper for a laureate; he prides himself openly on being heir to a manner and a 'mystery;' his art is intensely sophisticated and almost always self-conscious. He even boasts in good set terms that he is a divinely dowered poet." The relentlessly arrogant pose of this sophomoric self-consciousness is noted in Watson's verses on "The Sovereign Poet:"

> He sits above the clang and dust of time,
> With the world's secret trembling on his lip;
> He asks not converse or companionship.
> In the cold starlight where thou canst not climb.

In his spirit and manner there are echoes of Matthew Arnold. Subservient to tradition, his themes and his symbolism have often a reminiscential flavor, if not actually hackneyed and trite. In refreshing and enlivening contrast, our author says, is the work of John Davidson, who is, above all else, modern and individual, with restless sincerity for the prevailing note of his art. He is called "the bard of a new world in process of making," intensely alive and "experienced in this age of contending ideals, perishing creeds, and slowly evolving systems. Everywhere he grasps the rudest facts of modern civilization and finds in the most forbidding externalities an essential spirit of beauty, which he knows words to evoke. The stacks of a factory town that 'lacquer the sooty sky;' the shrieks of steam whistles 'that pipe the morning up before the lark;' the telegraph wire 'taut and lithe, within the wind a core of sound;' the railway train, 'a monster taught to come to hand amain'—these and similar modern realities, because of which Ruskin refused to be comforted, simply challenge Davidson's virile imagination and put it into fierce play in the service of a brave love of life. . . . Nothing modern is foreign to him, and some of his best effects are secured from the most sordid material." One sharp criticism is provoked by Davidson's flaunting treatment of

religious themes, which has caused him to be dubbed "the man who dares." He uses Christianity as a means of fitting himself out with the paraphernalia of art, using its symbols, names, and terms for merely decorative effect. The last of the trio of newcomers is Francis Thompson, who, our author says, offers us beauty far beyond anything that William Watson or John Davidson can produce. In contrast with Davidson, Thompson's spirit "lives within a magic crystal sphere, which gives entrance to but few of the commonplace objects of modern life, but holds afar off its crass immediacy and bewildering insistency of appeal and its coarse and glaring disorder. It is as the poet of an inviolate region of intense personal emotion that he is specially distinguished." His rhythms mark him as preeminently a singer. "Watson's verse is 'frozen music;' Thompson's is the exquisitely modulated utterance of a flexible, vibrant voice. The latter is master of rich and intricate harmonies, of delicate and airily drifting effects, of splendid and audacious metrical effects. . . . Although he is doubtless a virtuoso of the dictionary, making exhibition of his technical command of its pages, yet his imagination keeps pace with his phrasing, and his radical fault in showy passages is, perhaps, not so much luxuriance of language as extravagance of imagery. As a seer of visions Francis Thompson is by all odds the greatest of the younger poets. . . . In the intensity and quality of his passion, as well as in the scope and vividness of his imagination, he is to-day preeminent. Watson, when compared with him, is wan and conventional, and Davidson turbid and murky. . . . Neither in mood nor in treatment is Thompson to be classed with the devotees of art for art's sake. His poetry emancipates and strengthens, whereas theirs unnerves, and is evermore 'wreathing a flowery band to bind us to the earth.' Beauty there is everywhere in his poetry, but it is spiritual as well as sensuous; it is quintessential, primordial, regenerative; it is beauty that stings the spirit into keener activity and more passionate aspiration." These are some of the things which are said in the piquant, suggestive, lucid, and enjoyable book which we now reluctantly lay down.

The Man that Corrupted Hadleyburg. By MARK TWAIN. Crown 8vo, pp. 398. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, $1.75.

It is not possible for the name of Samuel L. Clemens to go down to posterity as that of a mere jester. He is moralist as well as humorist. Often a serious purpose runs through his parables, paradoxes, exaggerations, ironies. His shrewdly satirical article in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine* last year, on "Christian Science," was possibly the fittest and fatalest treatment which that elusive and delusive subject has anywhere received. There are eighteen stories and essays in this volume, which takes its title from the first of them. One is concerning the Jews, a people who have long been the butt of many baseless, vicious animosities. One of the reproaches against them has been that they were willing to feed upon a

country, but not to fight for it. This essay says that this slur cannot hold up its head in presence of the figures of the War Department. In the civil war the Jews were represented in the armies and navies of both North and South by ten per cent of their numerical strength—the same percentage furnished by the Christian population of both sections. General O. O. Howard says, "Intrinsically there are no more patriotic men to be found in the country than those of Hebrew descent who served with me in parallel commands or directly under me." Fourteen Jewish families contributed, between them, fifty-one soldiers to the war, in one case a father and four sons. But the one thing to be noted now concerning this grizzled veteran of American letters, whose shaggy white head fronts the title-page of this book of which he is the author, is that, though he has never taken on the air of saintship, the royal manhood of him stands to-day before all the world so superior and superb, tall and erect as the Ten Commandments are, that some who have posed as saints would not measure to his loins if subjected to the painful ordeal of comparison with him. Sir Walter Scott toiled to pay debts, the result largely of his own extravagance, and for which he was legally bound. George William Curtis toiled through early manhood to pay debts for which he felt bound, not by law, but by his own self-respect. And now this man, thought of by many only as a jester, suddenly towers up as about the tallest example of the very chivalry of probity to be found among authors. Six years ago a publishing firm, which he was financially backing, failed, owing over $200,000. Though not legally liable, he announced that he would pay all the debts; and, past sixty years of age, started out to earn the money by a lecturing tour round the world, having previously given up all his property. And his statement, sent to the creditors of the publishing firm before he sailed westward from Vancouver, in August, 1895, is worthy to be graven in gold and have a tablet by itself in the Hall of Fame: "I intend these lectures for the benefit of the creditors. The law recognizes no mortgage on a man's brain, and a merchant who has given up all he has may take advantage of the laws of insolvency and start free for himself again. But I am not a business man, and honor is a harder master than the law. It cannot compromise for less than one hundred cents on the dollar, and its debts never outlaw." The whole world of upright men rejoices that his brave, high undertaking has not only paid the last penny of his self-imposed burden, but placed him once more in comfort and independence. His is "that sensibility of principle, that chastity of honor, which feels a stain like a wound." When you make your list of manliest Americans you cannot omit Mark Twain, who has contributed not alone to the gayety of nations, but to the regal splendor of manhood. Professor Stevens, of Yale, thinks the ethicizing of theology one of the marked features of religious progress in the nineteenth century. The ethicizing of commercial life after the highest standards of honesty and honor is of equal import.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

History of the Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With a Commentary on its Offices. By R. J. COOKE, M.A., D.D. 12mo, pp. 313. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. New York: Eaton & Mains. Price, cloth, $1.20.

The title of this engaging volume hardly suggests to the stranger its wide scope of discussion. It is, in other words, more than a scholarly study of the verbal structure of the Ritual of our Church—with an exact tracing of the processes by which cumbersome and heretical phrases were displaced and the present familiar and hallowed forms adopted for general use. All of this, however important, is found in the second portion of the volume. But, since the record of the development of every great document is not less vital than the finished product itself, Dr. Cooke does well first to consider the story of the origin of the Ritual. This purpose leads to the opening of a chapter in Church history than which none is more thrilling. The time was the vivid and immortal period when English royalty broke with the Romish Church, and out of the strife of tongues and the shedding of martyrs' blood there emerged the virile Protestantism of England, evermore to live its separate existence and cheer the world with its benedictions. Through the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, James I, Charles II, and William of Orange—and with such conspicuous figures engaged in the great struggle as Cranmer, Latimer, Laud, and other prelates of the English Church beyond the enumeration—the process went on to its completion. To marshal these great leaders in succession, with a proper regard for historical perspective, to trace through more than two and a half centuries the gradual development of the Ritual which is now ours, and to do this with an impartiality that shall disarm the antagonism of those who stand for prelatical rights and dignities, is a task which only a master should attempt. Yet from a reasonably careful reading of his volume we are persuaded that Dr. Cooke has well succeeded in this effort. His lead is, in other words, as safe as it is instructive, while he directs us through this fascinating, pregnant, and memorable period of ecclesiastical history. After such a necessary and ample review of the steps that led to the framing of the Ritual, the reader comes to the author's "Commentary," or verbal study of the text, which, as already noticed, makes up the second part of the volume. It may only be said of this, in a word, that it is intelligent and helpful. Take, for instance, the note upon the use of the "*Gloria in Excelsis*," in the observance of the Lord's Supper. Dr. Cooke writes: "If said, then it should be said by all; for, if sung, it would be, or should be, sung by all. But it is more in harmony with the first communion service to sing the '*Gloria in Excelsis*' than to say it, for we read in Matthew that 'when they had sung a hymn they went out,' thus concluding the events of that hour. No liturgy in the world comes to a more solemn or majestic conclusion. All the grandeur and magnificence of language is put into it; the sacred fire of ecstatic love, adoration, thanksgiving,

and praise glows in every ascription of honor and glory, and it is most fitting that all who have partaken of this holy institution should sing their gratitude in this peerless hymn of the universal Church." From this extract the scope of the whole "Commentary" may be inferred. The indebtedness of the Church to Dr. Cooke for its construction is certainly great, and in its use by our ministers there can be only benefit. What a stimulus it is to discover, for illustration, that the germs—or even a considerable portion of our order for the Lord's Supper—is to be found in the form adopted by Parliament in 1548! So do the familiar lines of the eucharistic service take on new dignity and value, while the faces of venerable archbishops and reformers frame themselves upon the page, and the oft-used lines become animate with the life of the long past. Dr. Cooke, we may repeat, has done well a difficult task, and in his story of the development of a great document makes a vigorous call upon the Church for more intelligent worship. In his preface he offers thanks to the friends who have encouraged him in his undertaking, especially to "that eminent layman, Robert T. Miller, Esq., of Covington, Ky., who to business sagacity of a high order has united in leisure hours the ever-deepening love of scholarly pursuits valuable to Methodism."

The Life of James Dwight Dana, Scientific Explorer, Mineralogist, Geologist, Zoologist, Professor in Yale University. By DANIEL C. GILMAN, President of the Johns Hopkins University. Crown 8vo, pp. 409. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, $2.

Well worthy to be written is the life of this distinguished naturalist, explorer, investigator, writer, editor, and teacher, who holds honorable rank alongside such men as Linnæus, Cuvier, Darwin, and Agassiz —men who excelled in special, patient, and prolonged investigation, yet who also had the power to take broad views of nature and her laws, and who thus became to their contemporaries the philosophical interpreters of that small portion of the cosmos which comes within the cognizance of man. Dana was an eminent scientist, whose intellect assented to the doctrines of Christianity and his heart to its precepts, while his life was pervaded from beginning to end with a sincere and unobtrusive religious faith. Among the letters in this volume are included parts of his correspondence with Asa Gray, Guyot, Darwin, Agassiz, Sir Archibald Geikie, Professor Judd, and other colaborers in the field of science. Considerable space is given to the interesting but perilous cruise made by Dana as one of the scientific staff in the United States exploring expedition of three ships which spent four years, from 1838 to 1842, in investigating the coasts and islands of the Pacific Ocean. Dana was mineralogist to a corps which included also botanists, taxidermists, philologists, ethnographers, artists, and various naturalists. Much interest, scientific and other, attaches to Dana's observations during this eventful and often exciting cruise. At Rio de Janeiro he was much impressed by the characteristics of the negroes met everywhere in the city, and

wrote: "They appear to be a grade higher than the negroes of our country. This is owing to the political privileges the free blacks enjoy. They are equally entitled with the whites to the offices under government, and are treated in every way as equals. There is nothing of that prejudice which color excites with us, and black and white are seen mingling together with only those distinctions of rank which must exist in every state of society. The consequence is that the blacks have more self-respect, and, without losing respect for their superiors, seem to feel themselves to be men." The natives of the South Sea Islands gave the explorers no welcome; they did not want to be discovered. To the friendly overtures of the Americans they answered: "Go back to your own lands; this belongs to us, and we do not want anything to do with you." The fleet spent a month in the region of Samoa, then almost unknown, now well known to the world chiefly through Robert Louis Stevenson, who "sought to find the words of vital aptness and animation" for describing its enchanting beauty. Mark Twain, in his *Following the Equator*, tells how to find Samoa: "You will have no trouble about finding it if you follow the directions given by Louis Stevenson to Dr. Conan Doyle and Mr. J. M. Barrie—'You go to America, cross the continent to San Francisco, and then it is the second turning to the left.'" President Gilman records his belief that Stevenson's writings will be read as long as Sir Walter Scott's. The expedition was at Manila in January, 1842, and Commander Wilkes wrote: "The Philippines, in their capacity for commerce, are certainly among the most favored portions of the globe." On the coast of Terra del Fuego they were long in deadly peril of shipwreck, and Dana wrote: "To avoid all disquietude when death comes so near is scarcely possible; but, thanks to the saving grace of our dear Redeemer, I looked with little dread on its approach. I committed myself to the care of our heavenly Father and retired to rest." There are many signs that his four years at sea were marked by the deepening and confirming of his religious life. No scientific investigations interested him so much as did his examination into the work of the Christian missions he visited in various parts of the world—in the Society Islands, the New Hebrides, the Samoan, and others. He was filled with reverent admiration for the heroically self-denying lives and holy characters of the missionaries in their lonely posts, and with hallowed and joyous wonder at the mighty transformations wrought in savage heathen populations by the mysterious dynamic influence of the Gospel. This great scientist's appreciation of his own favored lot is expressed in a letter written long afterward to a lifelong friend: "I have never failed, as each year has passed, to recognize with gratitude the divine goodness which gave us Christian homes on the same street in the same pleasant Christian city, where Sunday schools were a delight, and other Christian influences pointed heavenward. I still labor on, doubting if this year may not be my last on earth, yet rejoicing in my work and my home, and in that upper home toward which life con-

verges." President Gilman says: "It is doubtful whether among Christian biographies of this century the like of Dana can be found. Here is a man exclusively devoted to science. To explore the regions of the unknown, to record new facts, to discover better principles of classification, and to reveal, if possible, laws of nature hitherto hidden, is the dominant occupation of his life. But simultaneously the transcendent purpose of his soul is the service of his Master—a fact which is apparent in his letters as a traveler and explorer, constantly manifested in his letters to his mother, often revealed in his scientific writings, and perpetually shown in his daily walk and conversation. 'Lord, I thank thee that I think thy thoughts after thee,' might have been Dana's own utterance. The astronomers and mathematicians for centuries were men of strong religious convictions—Kepler, Galileo, Copernicus, Newton, Leibnitz. So was Linnæus. So in recent days was Clerk Maxwell. So were many of Dana's most distinguished coworkers—Agassiz, Henry, Gray, Pierce, Torrey, Hitchcock. All of them may have been as religious as he; but few of them, if any, have left on record so many expressions of religious devotion. A selection might be made from his letters which would seem to indicate that he was wholly absorbed in his religious duties, like one of the brotherhood in a consecrated order—a Benedictine or Franciscan; and yet one might live near him without ever being annoyed by words not fitly spoken, indeed, without ever hearing any but the most simple and natural allusions to his Christian faith." We must frankly confess that our one dissatisfaction with this valuable biography is that we are too frequently tantalized by being told of illustrations that might be given, and selections that might be made which would reveal to us more completely the inner life of Professor Dana. Our hungry and somewhat impatient comment is, Why were they not given us? In 1851 Dana writes to Professor Guyot: "I have recently endeavored to explain your views upon the harmony of Science and the Mosaic account of the Creation, before a few gentlemen, but wished much that you were here to do the subject justice. Professor Mitchell has also been lecturing on this point, and takes the same basis for his explanations—the nebular theory. But he is only an astronomer—no geologist, chemist, or zoologist—and his views are therefore imperfect in detail and wanting in philosophical spirit. There is something exceedingly sublime in the command, '*Sit lux*,' when we consider that light is the first index of chemical combination and molecular change, and therefore the command is equivalent to 'Let force act.' The vivifying impulse thus given to particles before inert would send a flash of light through the universe." Twenty-five years later he wrote to Guyot: "With regard to species, I am a little off from my old ground and yours. But the more I have thought of late over the first chapter of Genesis, the more ready I have been to believe that the fiats were the commencement of a series of productions, through force imparted at the time to nature. Is not this the

true interpretation of the language? This is essentially the view taken by Professor Tayler Lewis, of Schenectady, whom I once criticised on account of it." In one of his last years Dana wrote: "I have all my life found great satisfaction in being virtually an Englishman, rejoicing in and wondering over the grandeur and power of the British nation." This is the story of a life consecrated to the pursuit of exact truth and the service of "the God of things as they are," a life in which is no trace of selfishness, no neglect of opportunities, no unworthy motive. Its motto might have been: THE WORKS OF THE LORD ARE GREAT; SOUGHT OUT OF ALL THEM THAT HAVE PLEASURE THEREIN.

MISCELLANEOUS.

John Wesley. By FRANK BANFIELD. 16mo, pp. 128. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

Among the many biographies, sketches, and studies of John Wesley this small book has a clear and independent individuality of its own. The author ventures on his well-worn subject, because, though no new facts can be presented, the well-known facts may be susceptible of other constructions than those placed on them by past writers, especially when the founder of Arminian Methodism has been over a century in his grave and unprejudiced judgments concerning him and his work are more possible to all sorts and conditions of men. The most serious criticism of the Methodist movement by Southey, who expressed the moderate Anglican view of his time, is summed up as a deprecation of what is called "enthusiasm;" "but," the author says, "for critics of this type, any serious, earnest concern of the individual in the matter of his eternal destiny would appear to deserve such qualification. Wesley unquestionably was the means of exciting deep concern in tens of thousands of English men and women." And the manifestation of strong religious feeling was not pleasing to "superfine people who could understand a human being who was disturbed over a bad dinner but not if he was disquieted about his soul." For this class of critics Mr. Banfield has little regard, as also for the critics of the more agnostic type, who find in the catch phrases of the materialistic psychology a solution of the problem presented by a great moral and religious movement, of whose pipings in the market place he doubts whether they are entirely reassuring and satisfactory to the agnostic pipers themselves. He looks upon John Wesley as a special instrument of Providence for lifting Anglo-Saxondom out of the paganism in which it was wallowing when he began his work, lifting the English masses out of the mire and slough of brutality and sensuality and indifferentism; and upon the evangelical revival as a great and far-reaching episode in human history. He truly says that it was a powerful "counter movement to the one with which the names of Voltaire and Rousseau are associated, which wrought such appalling mischief in France. While the *bourgeoisie* who

were to rule France were being infected with the corruption of a shallow mockery, the English masses became more distinctly Christian than they had been for several generations. The one movement was toward the heights, the other toward depths where all things were foul, slimy, leprous, and hateful." Mr. Banfield has, as he hoped, told the story of John Wesley in few words, fairly, squarely, and readably. His little book is one more indication of what may be called the Wesley renaissance, which is now witnessed in general literature outside of Methodism.

The Life of Christ as Represented in Art. By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen and to the House of Commons. 8vo, pp. 507. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, $3.50.

Canon Farrar's *Life of Christ* has been for years one of the most popular among the many lives of our Saviour. That work is beautifully supplemented in this new volume by reproducing all that the best art has had to say in painting or in sculpture about Christ. The illustrations are a multitude. Art in all the Christian centuries has been fascinated with Christ and has devoted its noblest genius to portraying Him in all phases and incidents of His life. Whatever else art might neglect, it could never be indifferent to the One altogether lovely. And it has hovered reverently about Him, to catch His every look, as if it knew instinctively where and Who is the center of all life. The great painters have preached mighty sermons with their art. The pictures here reproduced reflect the religious tone, temper, and conceptions of many centuries and countries. Ruskin has said, "Great nations write their autobiographies in three manuscripts—the book of their deeds, the book of their words, and the book of their art; but of the three the only quite trustworthy one is the last." Proof of this, the author says, is seen in Westminster Abbey, in the contrast between the eighteenth century piles of incongruous statuary—their meaningless paganism, crude vulgarity, conventional commonplace, and affectation of being terribly at ease in Sion—and, on the other hand, the noble images of the dead Crusaders, their hands humbly folded upon their breast; in the antithesis between the way in which life and death were regarded by an age of belief, however erring, and an age in which skepticism and worldliness were prevalent. The larger part of the pictures herein reproduced are from the great Italian masters of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, whose supremacy is generally acknowledged; a small part from the Dutch, German, and Flemish painters, and very few from the Spanish painters, who, with the exception of Velasques, are far inferior. The history of the changing phases of religious thoughts and feelings cannot be fully known without a chronological study of sacred art, such as this book promotes and assists. It would perhaps be difficult to find anyone whose taste and culture more adequately qualify him to perform satisfactorily the task which is here undertaken than this accomplished and brilliant prelate of the Anglican Church.



Charles H. Payne.

METHODIST REVIEW.

MARCH, 1901.

ART. I.—CHARLES H. PAYNE, D.D., LL.D.

THERE are men of thought, and there are men of achievement. Some characters defy exclusive classification with either type because they belong at once to both. Such a man was Charles Henry Payne. In his case there was the epic of both the inner and the outer life. He was born at Taunton, Mass., October 24, 1830, and entered into rest at Clifton Springs, New York, May 5, 1899. His career falls naturally into four divisions—the period of preparation, the period of pastoral service, the period of his college presidency, and the period of his educational secretaryship.

The first school which he entered was the school of adversity, and "adversity makes men." He was the youngest of seven children. His father, dying while he was a babe, left the mother in straitened circumstances. The boy grew up under the pinch of poverty. In his early life there was far more of toil than of play. While yet very young he acquired that discipline attained only through limitations. He came to manhood nervy and self-reliant. He was accustomed from the beginning to meet obstacles and to overcome them. He experienced the power of the new birth when eighteen years of age. As has been so often the case with the marked men of history, the Spirit of God found him engaged at the common tasks of life. He was a clerk in a country store at North Dighton, Mass. The effect of his conversion was electric. Its immediate result was a consuming religious zeal and a quickened intellectual activity. He at once joined the Church, under the pastorate of the Rev. William Cone, a devout and

successful minister. He began to take an active part in public meetings. The Church was quick to recognize his zeal and native ability, and granted him a local preacher's license at the beginning of 1850. At that time he was teaching a district school near his native village. The character of his early preaching was influenced largely by reading Finney's *Revival Sermons* and by association with James Caughey, the evangelist. He had a zeal to win men from the first. His first sermon was from the text "Prepare to meet thy God." From time to time he held meetings in schoolhouses and farmhouses, preaching to the rural population—many of whom became Christians through his labors. These early experiences gave color to his entire ministry. To the end his life was strong in evangelistic purpose and power. At once he recognized the ministry as a high calling. It must not be entered upon without due preparation, but the means for an education were lacking. To many a faint-hearted young man this would have proved a fatal discouragement. To him it was nothing. He could make his own way, and he did. Mostly by teaching he worked his way through East Greenwich Seminary and Wesleyan University, with a brief course at Concord Biblical Institute.

Graduating from college in 1856, he was married in 1857 to Miss Eleanor Gardiner, of Wickford, Rhode Island. He joined the Providence Conference and had successful pastorates at Sandwich, East Bridgewater, Fall River, and Broadway Church, Providence. As the result of his strain to secure an education he was hampered in the earlier years of his ministry by wavering health. At the Conference of 1865 he felt compelled to ask for a year of rest, and took a nominal appointment. A few weeks later he happened to be passing through New York. Dr. Cyrus D. Foss had just been appointed to the pastorate of St. Paul's Church, leaving vacant the pulpit of South Fifth Street Church, Brooklyn. Dr. James Porter, Book Agent in New York, was associated with this church. Learning of Dr. Payne's presence in the city, he secured him to preach as the pulpit supply for the Sunday following. On the preceding Friday night President Lincoln had been assassinated. The whole country was in a state of

panic. It is impossible to describe the feelings with which the people gathered in the churches for worship on that memorable Sunday morning. At the South Fifth Street Church the occasion and the man met and fitted each other. The preacher of the day came to his task full-armored. By his sane and masterly treatment of the crisis he completely captivated the large congregation. The officiary of the church came together at once and insisted that he should abide among them and be their minister. This leads to the mention of a prominent trait of Dr. Payne's character and ministry. He was ever an ardent patriot. Nothing stirred his soul more quickly or more deeply than civic unrighteousness or disloyalty. Again and again we have seen him under the spell of this noble passion when his whole being was tremulous and dynamic, even to the very tips of his fingers. The last entry in his diary, made but a few days before his departure, was upon a question of national policy.

Dr. Payne yielded to the wishes of the people and became the pastor of South Fifth Street Church. The appointment proved the turning point in his career. From that day to the end he moved upon the top level of opportunity. He justified the confidence of his friends by a series of splendid achievements unsurpassed by any of our leaders in this generation. Before he had been long at South Fifth Street his enterprising spirit conceived a great plan of expansion, and with consummate skill he led his people forth to build St. John's Church on Bedford Avenue, which was, at its completion in 1868, the noblest structure in American Methodism. His fame went abroad. Soon his good name was in all the churches. The Arch Street Church of Philadelphia was considering a similar enterprise, and sought this young Hercules to be its leader. He went to be the pastor of this church in the spring of 1868. Upon the evening of his public reception the sum of $80,000 was subscribed toward the enterprise. Here again he did heroic service, and led the people on to a remarkable victory. Before the end of the second year of his pastorate the costly and beautiful temple was dedicated. "Thus within five years his magnificent energy built two superb monuments, one of brownstone, the other of marble, which will long stand

as memorials of his intrepid and inspiring leadership and practical power." Two additional pastorates completed his twenty years of pastoral service, one of these being at Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, the other at St. Paul's Church, Cincinnati.

As a successful pastor Dr. Payne is a model worthy of careful study. Men of his type in the pulpit have done much to make Methodism what it is. He was a striking contradiction of the widespread and harmful notion that no man can be at once a faithful pastor and a great preacher. He considered a thousand pastoral calls per year a moderate achievement. Meantime, his increasing grip upon truth was tremendous, and his pulpit efforts ranked with the best in the land. As a shepherd of the flock none could exceed him in tender ministrations. But his was not merely a mission of insipid sentimentality to the feeble-minded. He led himself the strenuous life. He dealt with great moral problems with a viselike grip. As an administrator of affairs he never flinched at the most costly and disagreeable duty. His undaunted courage in dealing with practical and difficult problems amounted to heroism. Upon the occasion of a social event at the home of one of his members he was surprised to discover that wine was being served. His tract, "The Social Glass and Christian Obligation," was the result, which is one of the most sane and persuasive pleas anywhere to be found for the Christian principle of total abstinence. And yet so considerately was the entire subject handled that this parishioner and his family remained the firm friends of Dr. Payne to the end of his life.

Halfway through a great church-building enterprise he required a man who had subscribed $50,000 to withdraw from the membership of the church. The material temple might not be completed, but the spiritual temple should be kept pure at any cost. For years afterward Dr. Payne never returned to preach in the city in which this remarkable event occurred but that this man and his family were present to hear him. What a tribute to his preeminently Christian method of dealing with difficult problems! This quality of his ministry is well illustrated by the stirring events of his last pastorate.

thus described by Dr. William V. Kelley, his successor in the pastorate of Spring Garden Street Church, Philadelphia:

His ministry did not lack the gladiatorial passion. The militant spirit burned in his breast and made him fond of the fray. The sight of audacious and insolent wickedness filled him with holy rage. He showed himself a soldier of the cross, a knight of his Master, the King's, Round Table, sworn to "ride abroad redressing human wrong, to break the heathen and uphold the Christ." This is remarkably illustrated in his pastorate in Cincinnati, which began in 1874 in the midst of the excitement of the great temperance revival known as the Women's Crusade in Ohio. He promptly entered the thick of the fight, opening his pulpit battery on his third Sunday there with a volley so damaging that the mayor, whom he arraigned, thought it necessary to defend himself in the press with "An Open Letter to Dr. Payne," to which Dr. Payne at once replied with "An Open Letter to the Mayor," who, as he pointed out was evading his duty and protecting the saloons. In this letter, which shook the city, Dr. Payne was a front-fighter, and his wife was one of forty-three Christian women who were arrested by the police for praying with the liquor-sellers and were hurried off to the station house along with thieves and harlots. When they were brought before the police court the justice dismissed them with the warning that if they committed their awful crime again they would be dealt with severely. Week after week the pulpit of St. Paul discussed the situation fairly but scathingly, exposing the perfidious and cowardly conduct of the city officials; and in all the prolonged excitement and provocation of the conflict Dr. Payne bore himself with such mingled fearlessness and wisdom as earned throughout the city and the State the grateful friendship of all decent people and the no less honoring hatred of the classes whose curse is their only benediction.

It is little wonder that a man with such qualities enjoyed for years the distinction of being one of the foremost ministers of Methodism and of the country. Nor is it strange that, while yet in Brooklyn, he was approached with reference to the pastorate of the old Park Street Congregational Church in Boston. To be summoned to a throne of such power would have proved too much for a man who was interested chiefly in making a career for himself. He declined the advance made, stating modestly that he preferred to remain a Methodist. This he did, not because he was a narrow bigot or an intense sectarian. He was far removed from either of these types. But he believed in the providential mission of Methodism, and he considered it worth while to sacrifice himself if thus

he could contribute somewhat to the fulfillment of this mission. This decision was characteristic of the man. He was ever loyal to the Church of his choice and love. Within a year of the time of his death, in a close heart-to-heart talk, he declared that if he were a young man again he would give his life to the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Our history records no finer instance of intelligent and whole-hearted loyalty than this.

In 1875 Dr. Payne was elected by the unanimous vote of the board of trustees to the presidency of Ohio Wesleyan University. His inauguration took place in June, 1876. The conditions prevailing at the time and the immediate influence of Dr. Payne's personality are thus portrayed by Professor Edward T. Nelson, the university's historian:

> Dr. Payne's administration began in the gloomiest days of financial depression; but the growth of the university during his administration was rapid and great. A quickened interest for the university was felt throughout the Church; the patronizing Conferences were stimulated to renewed efforts for the endowment; the school was advertised on a much more liberal scale than before, and the area of its patronage greatly enlarged. The university and the female college were united. As the result of all these influences, both the enrollment and the income of the university were doubled in a few years, and the endowment largely increased. Dr. Payne was always alert for the interests of the institution.

This new field afforded a fine sphere for the exercise of Dr. Payne's distinguished abilities, and he put himself into it with a spirit of *abandon* which was magnificent. No power of body or of brain was withheld. Under the touch of his organizing ability chaos gave way to orderly progress in every department. The momentous task which he immediately imposed upon himself found expression in the motto, "The Ohio Wesleyan University—let us aim to put a thousand students within her walls and a million dollars in her treasury." He gave attention to every detail. He knew every student, and especially took a practical, fatherly interest in those who needed assistance. To each one personally he was the devoted pastor; to the student body in general, the strong disciplinarian and at the same time the winsome evangelist. He was the prophet and leading citizen of the community. No

bishop of the Church or far-famed lecturer could attract such audiences as month after month for years attended his Sunday afternoon lectures in the opera house. It has not been given us to witness a series of greater oratorical masterpieces than these. It was often whispered that the Church's greatest men were in the East. But neither the East nor the West during this generation has produced men who in platform and pulpit ability were able to outrank Dr. Payne at his best.

In addition to his onerous home duties he delivered sermons, lectures, and addresses throughout the State of Ohio and other States north, south, east, and west, traveling without a dollar's expense to the university, though in its interests, twelve thousand miles a year. He poured freely of his own personal savings into the treasury of the institution, giving during his presidency in the aggregate nearly eight thousand dollars. Such devotion won the admiration of all, and all but achieved the ideal with which he began his work. In the first year of his incumbency there were 323 students; in the last year there were 973, while the assets of the institution steadily increased until they were well on toward the million mark.

In his annual report for 1889 President Bashford, in a just and generous reference to the invaluable service of his predecessor, Dr. Payne, said:

> His administration marked a great transition in the history of the university. He brought about the union of the college and of the Ohio Wesleyan Female College, and established coeducation upon a permanent basis. He secured additional and able teachers for the faculty. He greatly increased the number of students in attendance at the college. He struggled earnestly and successfully to enlarge the endowments of the university. He transformed and improved the courses of study. He infused new vigor into the administration of the college, and by necessary sternness raised the moral and mental standards of our students. He became the prophet of the community, and led the city in notable civic reform. He became the evangelist of the college, and inaugurated sweeping revivals, thus quickening and elevating the spiritual life of hundreds of young people who have since blessed the world by their influence. Since his call to the secretaryship of the Board of Education he has continued to cooperate heartily and unselfishly with his successor in raising funds for the university. In his wider relations to the educational work of our Church he has lifted the standard of admission to our colleges, unified the educational work of Methodism,

quadrupled the contributions to the Board of Education, and rendered invaluable service to higher education in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Charles H. Payne brought to the discharge of all his duties as pastor, president, and secretary, clear thinking, profound convictions, and a strong, manly, courageous spirit. The Ohio Wesleyan University owes him a debt of gratitude which succeeding generations will recognize increasingly. He builded for the future, and the historian of the university will recognize him as one of the potent factors in molding her destiny. He stands with his noble compeers, Thomson and Merrick, as worthy to rank with Fisk of Middletown, Hopkins of Williams, McCosh of Princeton, Dunster and Mather of Harvard, and Stiles and the elder Dwight of Yale, among the leaders of higher education in America.

However brilliant and gratifying the achievement with regard to the university's material prosperity, Dr. Payne always placed the emphasis upon the spiritual side of the work. Let his own words from his last report to the board of trustees, made in 1888, bear witness. He says:

The most gratifying part of all my work in this university has been that connected with its moral and religious development. Without this feature it would have missed its chief charm, and could by no means have held me as long as it has. It has been a great and intensely interesting pastoral charge, and no pastor in the Church could have felt, and borne up under the burden, the weight of responsibility for the religious welfare of his charge more than I have felt as a perpetual care upon my heart. That these hundreds of young men and women might come into early and intimate fellowship with Christ, the ideal man; that they might pattern after his perfect character and imitate his unselfish life; that they might seek all noblest ends, and be swayed by all highest motives and impulses, this has been ever the object of my constant prayer and unceasing endeavor. And it has been a constant source of marvel, as well as of gratification, that so large a number of youths, gathered from all classes in society, should maintain such a high average of good order and pure morals and religious character as have been exhibited in this institution. The specifically religious aspects of my work have occupied much of my time, and brought abundant and gratifying rewards. The monthly Sabbath lecture, continued through all these years, most of the time in the City Opera House, with seldom other than a crowded audience of citizens and students, has given me the opportunity, highly prized, of meeting both these classes, of neighbors and of pupils, as a religious teacher. The weekly prayer meeting with the students, in which I have met them as a pastor, and the gracious revival seasons, with their protracted services, have all furnished me with full pastoral work of the most important character, and have

yielded most gratifying results. In the twelve years of my active connection with the university, very nearly, or quite, one thousand students, the flower of this land and of other lands, have professed faith in Christ. It is impossible rightly to estimate the broad sweep of influence resulting from this work.

Dr. Payne was elected by the General Conference of 1888 to the position of Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Education. "The transition from his college presidency to this office was a natural and fitting one, and for the work of his new sphere his experience at Delaware was a fine preparation. He entered on his new duties not as an amateur, but as a master in educational matters. The versatility with which he applied his faculties to all parts of his work amazed his friends. Year after year he devised fresh programmes for Children's Day with remarkable fertility of invention. Though not an artist, he designed pictures, and, though not known as a poet, he wrote hymns. But, while he handled these details ingeniously and skillfully, his more important work was large enough and substantial enough to be called monumental." His grasp upon the general educational problems of the Church was clear and comprehensive. To him very much is due for what has been accomplished in the coordination of our schools and colleges and in the adoption of a high standard common to all our higher institutions. It was he who sounded the cry "Ten Milllions for our Educational Institutions for the New Century." The imperativeness of Christian education had burned itself so deeply into his soul that it had become the ruling passion of his life. Of his efficiency as Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Education his successor in office, Dr. W. F. McDowell, thus writes:

As student, teacher, pastor, college president, corresponding secretary, Dr. Payne won well-deserved distinction. As a student he touched all phases of school life as seen in the public school, the academy, the college, and the theological school. As pastor he became familiar with church life in towns and cities. As president of Ohio Wesleyan University he came to know practically the life and problems of our Christian colleges. As corresponding secretary of this Board he broadened his field both of observation and usefulness until he touched the entire Church with his influence.

His devotion to education was thorough and lifelong, beginning in his early struggle to obtain an education in spite of limited means, poor

health, and manifold obstacles. His devotion to Christian education developed at last into a passion. To this cause he gave the last twenty-five years of his life; for it he spake and wrote his most burning and eloquent words; to further it on every field he spared not himself. He stood ever and everywhere for sound learning; sham culture was hateful to his very soul. But he stood especially for Christian culture. During his presidency he increased endowments, raised the standards, enlarged the courses of study, multiplied the attendance of students, and represented the Ohio Wesleyan far and wide; but his chief joy at the last was that more than a thousand students were converted there during his administration. It is doubtful whether the argument for the Christian college was ever more forcefully stated than in his last tract, "The Christian College a Necessity." His voice was heard often in the Church; it was never heard advocating anything unworthy or unmanly or unrighteous. Two words were frequently on his lips—"character" and "manliness." He obtained his ideas of each not in the "ivory palaces of kings," but in the heroic New England of a half century ago, from his Puritan ancestry and from the two Testaments.

On many a platform and in many a pulpit he spoke like a master. He was a commanding preacher, ranking with the greatest our later Church has produced. He was a radical, having the blood and spirit of a reformer.

For eleven years he was Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Education. His work in this great office is seen in a score of ways, and has been felt throughout our entire educational system. He left the affairs of the office in perfect order. His records needed neither explanation nor adjustment. They were without spot or blemish.

He was a deeply religious man. He lived the white life. His public prayers and daily conduct convinced men that he knew the way into the secret place of the Most High. He honored the King and loved the Church. He enthroned the Christ in his life and sought to enthrone him in society. He leaves an unstained name, a noble record of large service, and has gone with clean hands to receive a rich reward.

Regarding his character and services to the Church let those speak who know the facts, and who have a right to be heard:

Dr. W. V. Kelley: A tremendous sort of man was this Charles H. Payne.

Dr. J. M. Buckley: His office is vacant and may be filled; his place is greater than his office—that must remain vacant.

Dr. C. E. Jefferson: He was one of the giants; in many ways a phenomenal man, one of the greatest teachers of the century, one of the most eloquent preachers that ever filled a pulpit, a man of indomitable and unflinching courage, who has left his mark in every city in which he has ever worked.

Dr. A. B. Leonard: In the pulpit and on the platform he had few equals. He has gone, but he has left to his family and to the Church of his love and choice a stainless record.

Dr. S. F. Upham: I knew Dr. Payne intimately. We were classmates in college, associates in Conference relations, and close personal friends for forty-five years. He was a genuine man, frank and open as the day. He attained deserved distinction in many lines, but it was in the pulpit that he shone with a bright, steady, and commanding light. He was preeminently a preacher. The Gospel which he preached was not a puny and inefficient sentimentalism, but the Gospel of a divine deliverance from sin. I heard his last public address. . . . How he pleaded that morning for a consecrated ministry! He went from the Conference room to die, but his work lives, and he lives, for "he that doeth the will of God abideth forever."

Bishop W. F. Mallalieu: Forty-eight years ago and a little more I first met Dr. Payne. From then till now we have been the closest friends. In all these years I never knew him to do or say anything that was wrong. "Mark the perfect man" may be said of him as truthfully as of any man I ever saw or ever expect to see. These last days have been days of silent grief and heartache. True friends that are perfectly trusted are so rare that it is an unspeakable loss when one departs from us. No man on earth was so near my heart as Dr. Payne. He was without fear and without reproach.

Bishop D. A. Goodsell: Dr. Payne brought knowledge, enterprise, and great ability to the work which went from my hands to his. I was startled at his activity and success. Whatever he did, he did with all his might. In God's service his hot heart burned itself out of this earthly life, and was exhaled to God.

Bishop C. D. Foss: He was a great preacher, a tireless worker, and a transparently true and faithful man. Few men have done so much for the Church as he.

Bishop J. H. Vincent: He was an earnest, intense, consecrated, and faithful man. He had many kinds of power, and he used all well. He was an extraordinary preacher, an ideal pastor, an able teacher, a powerful platform speaker, an efficient administrator, a true friend, and an uncompromising Christian.

Bishop E. G. Andrews: As the successor of Dr. Payne in the pastorate of St. John's Church, Brooklyn, I quickly came to know and value his character and work. The things notable in these were the strength of his convictions and his loyalty to them, his ability and faithfulness as preacher and pastor, his wise forecast of church opportunities and duties, and the strenuous will with which he wrought. After 1888, when he was made Secretary of the Board of Education, I came to know him still better. The qualities conspicuous in earlier years now appeared modified and heightened by large experience as pastor and educator. He had become a powerful and attractive preacher and platform speaker,

a wise counselor in the general life of the Church, a progressive theologian, a courageous yet cautious reformer in Church and State. To his new work he gave untiring industry, capacity for broad schemes, a luminous and effective advocacy, and an energy which neither indifference, opposition, nor his own imperfect health could abate. He believed in God, and therefore attempted and achieved great things.

As is very often the case with good men, Dr. Payne was frequently misunderstood. He was never a man of robust physical health. Throughout his career, he wrought under the disadvantages of physical weakness. The effect of this was sometimes to give a wrong impression as to the real spirit of the man. There were those who thought that the scalpel was his favorite instrument. But he never used it so mercilessly upon any other man as upon himself. He had lofty ideals for himself and for everybody else, and insisted upon a high measure of excellence everywhere. He despised shams. No man ever had a better right. He was himself absolutely transparent and sincere. He knew not how to fawn for favors. To balance the truth against self-interest was not in him. God's eternal law of righteousness was his pole star. He always steered by this, without fear of man or devil.

He was individual throughout. His gait upon the street, his laugh, his hand shake, his method of using his voice, his gestures—all were unique and inimitable. Personality throbbed at every point of contact. A man of so many angles, so insistent upon his ideals, so pertinacious in his purpose, so aggressive in his action, must now and then of necessity come into collision with men of similarly pronounced convictions. It has been said that he was ambitious. Naturally he was, but he ever held his ambition in check by the taut rein of conscience. The central figure of his ambition was not Charles H. Payne but Jesus Christ, his Lord and Master.

His versatility was remarkable. As a writer he excelled. His style was a happy combination of the forceful and the ornate. If the question in hand were one of morals or reform, he was incisive and luminous. He could write in words that burned and in sentences that breathed. He was a great reader all his life, and kept fully abreast of the times. The latest great book was frequently the subject of remark in his con-

versations and public addresses. Theologically he was progressive, in the best sense of the word. He did not allow himself to be tied to the old simply because it was old, nor yet to the new because new. What he demanded was the true and therefore the best, whether old or new. Thus he was related vitally, as every man of like spirit must be, to the achievements of the past and the progress of the present. It has been an open secret among the younger men of the Church for years that no man, young or old, in Methodism was more open-minded than Dr. Payne. The larger hope beat in his heart, and the larger vision charmed his soul.

To his other accomplishments he added in later years that of an expert money-raiser for church-building purposes. He had reduced that business to a science, and had many calls from all parts of the country, from Methodist and non-Methodist churches, to do that kind of work. His power in prayer has well been the subject of comment. He knew how to enter into the secret place of the Most High. And this —because he walked with God. If there were those who thought that his character was lacking in heart quality, it was because they did not know or failed to appreciate the man. Dr. Payne loved all men with Christian affection. The colored man never had a truer friend. None who knew his spirit were surprised that he bequeathed his splendid library to Gammon Theological Seminary. His love for his former students was intense and touching. No more was he the rigid disciplinarian, when once college walls had been left behind. He was now the interested friend and helpful brother. Their devotion to him was equally marked. To-day he is enshrined in the hearts of thousands. The home life was beautiful. To the loyal companion of his years he delighted to attribute the largest measure of his success, and upon each member of his family he bestowed a tender affection. If the Gospel standard of service be the criterion by which men shall be awarded their place in the history of our Church, then must high rank be given to Charles Henry Payne.



Art. II.—SHAKESPEARE'S MEN.

In Shakespeare was an abundant love of life. The vital streams had not run dry in the channels of his spirit, but were in spring freshet, overflowing the banks and inundating meadow lands and fields. When Shakespeare touches us we feel a vital shock, as if an electrode of the lightning had in passing grasped our wrists. He is no dyspeptic, with hung head and dolorous voice and mendacious replies and invective speech. He does not rage as Walter Savage Landor did, is not bellicose with sword at play as Shelley was, nor mild and remote as Wordsworth. He was impassioned as the storm, but sane and wholesome; he was like contact with the earth.

Charles Lamb—pale, slender, cloaked, nervous, stammering, playful, a delightful sort of human kitten, on his way now from the East India countinghouse to his half-mad, crabbed old father and Mary his sister, with insanity haunting her eyes—is loitering a moment buying at the Strand a volume of old plays and hiding it like miser's treasure beneath his cloak. Coleridge is complaisant, ethereal, discursive, bland, imperturbable, mild, with thought-orbit like the sweep of a planet, and is dreaming aloud in a conversation in which there are no associates. Keats—pale, reticent, invalid, a sensitive plant among poets and men, of classic thought, a Greek born centuries after the days of Greek intellectual supremacy—is holding dialogue with Endymion and Hyperion and Lamia until his pale cheek flushes like a girl's. Byron—tyrannical, scowling, revengeful, riding hard like an angry bandit—is cursing till his breath is spent. Chaucer—observant, buoyant, piquant, clad in the garment of a king's follower—drinks his wine which comes as part of his laureate stipend, mixes with courtier and soldier, well content, hearing, seeing, enjoying, rejoicing. Spenser is prisoner in the land of lotus-eaters, and sees the drift of blue smoke over distant hills, and hears the calling of the sea and of the wind, and thinks this world a picture. Tennyson—sad, dreamy, remote, feeling the world he does not see, looking eagerly "to where beyond these voices there is peace"—chants to himself and not to us,

And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.

Shakespeare—radiant, delighted, amused, careering like a yacht with favoring wind, laughing aloud without assigning reason for his laughter, intoxicated with the world he wanders in, as if it were old wine—is pleased with everything as on a holiday. He is as a country boy in town. Everything interests him. Flower, schoolboy with "morning face," beggar, prince, king, knave, slattern, fool, the pure, the debauched, the railer, the madman, the ingrate, the intriguer, the proud pine, the dim violet, an accusing conscience, the cliff that leans seaward and lifts heavenward, Falstaff and Pistol and Prince Hal, the lad Arthur and the bawd, Mistress Quickly, the moonlit bank, the "sere, the yellow leaf," the whiteness of Imogen and the black darkness of Iachimo—Shakespeare saw them all and was interested in them all. So it is nature or man or ghost, all is well with him, for he belonged to the brood of discoverers, Gilbert and Drake and Cabot and Raleigh and Hudson; only he discovered men—they, island and river and continent and inland sea. Not one among that glorious company was more adventurous than he. Like them he adventured on the uncharted seas. He sails on all waters, enters all harbors, lands at all ports, his pennant floating at the mast far as adventure dares to sail. Shakespeare's coat of arms would be, were I his herald, an archer with quiver full and the bow bent with arrow fitted on the string and all the air full of a shower of arrows. That should be his coat of arms and appear upon his banner. At every port of soul, however late one visits it or early, will be found Shakespeare's gonfalon floating there. He seems ubiquitous. His knowledge of the soul dazzles us like some great light. I feel more and more, as I consort with him, that he saw everything and that his scrutiny cannot be eluded. He does not need to look to see, but sees without that crude contrivance. A study of "Henry IV" will convince any skeptic that nothing is hidden from Shakespeare's eyes, whether he look or not. In this play and its successor, "Henry V," we are let into the very privacy of kings. We look them full in the face, and answer word for word. What they are we know. Shakespeare tells us. Do we not see

Henry Bolingbroke and Prince Hal? Are they not in truth become among the familiars of our household? Their cares, ambitions, anguishes, fears, tremors, stratagems, policies, alliances, court manners, privacies, and publicities; their glowing patriotism and barren selfishness; their thought's prologue, monologue, epilogue; their coronation gladness and gasping advices on a dying bed—were we not made privy to them all, as if we were gentlemen of the king's bedchamber? These two plays are dramas of royalty, and are hung about with kings' banners and helmets and shields. True as this observation is, more is to be said, if all the truth is to be uttered. England's two worlds are in these plays. The king's world of court, palace, queenly women, courtier, battlefield, debaucheries, royal wooing, waving banners, and the march—this king's world is here; and, besides, here is an underworld of Justice Shallow, with his farming and turnip crops and old beau speech and justice court and money-loaning and the tavern with its sack and bawds and bullies and grim humors and rollicking laughter and drunken quarrels—this underworld with shabby patriots and enlistments and cowardice and lechery, inanity, animosities, braggart speech, and craven retreats, contumacies, arrogancies, conceits. This England, too, is seen, not as through the dust of a summer's highway, but clearly as through air after a rain. I know not which is more admirable, Shakespeare's etching of the court or the tavern, his king's antechamber or his justice court. This double world that always lives and will live—Shakespeare is its biographer, and a sturdy Boswell he proves himself to be. The entire landscape is his. Nature, man, patrician, plebeian, honor, disgrace—this writer of plays knows them all, and calls each by name as if each were comrade. All zones are his. He loved every sign in the zodiac, and claimed each season as his favorite. Everything and everybody reported to him; he was receiving station for the world.

And he loved human kind. While not physicist nor psychologist nor politician, he was interested. Everybody impressed him. His was the art of extracting secrets, of inspiring confidences. Everybody told him his story, for this, among other reasons, he was a royal listener, and into this willing ear

Juliet sobbed her story, and Timon of Athens trumpeted his hate. Falstaff swaggered and drank and swore and lied to Shakespeare as to Prince Hal or carbuncle-nosed Bardolph; Marc Antony made no secret of his passion, such as made a scepter inconsequential; Macbeth stamped out his ravings in Shakespeare's presence; and Lady Macbeth walked with her lit candle in her hand so close to the poet he might have touched her; and Hamlet heeds him not what time he makes soliloquy; Lear curses his two daughters with scarce an intermission; Regan speaks her flint-hard words, nor cares that Shakespeare hears; Pericles weeps before him—he is the confidant of this divergent company. Dogberry and Malvolio and King Lear's fool and Launce and Justice Shallow and Iago and Leontes and Pandarus, Bassanio and Antonio and Shylock, Nym, Pistol, Bottom, Oberon, Angelo—besides all that sweet company of fair womanhood whispering or sobbing their story forth—they are every one voluble with him, showing no reticence or next to none; and he hears, sees all, and forgets nothing.

Shakespeare loves men and women, though, as for loving women, what man does not? I think no man has ever loved women more than he, and am quite sure no poet has. He has loved them so as to make many of them queens regnant forever, and has joyed to lift them into the heaven of the heroic and leave them there. My wonder is not at this, but that he so evidently loved men, and with such tropic warmth. He straitly enjoys them, sees their strength, applauds them so you can hear him crying, "Bravo, bravo," as one who watches a wrestler's skill, but strangely enough has not a hero among them, which is one of the strangest things in strange Shakespeare. His women have many heroines, his men have no heroes, howbeit he loves them both. How is this condition to be explained? Mayhap Shakespeare's vast chivalry is key to this exclusiveness of elevation in womanhood. Even Mistress Quickly he has dignified by making her in many regards the most bewildering feminine character his genius has produced. She is not admirable, but is anomalous and marvelous, and is in genius of execution sister to Falstaff. To explain this partiality in Shakespeare puts us at our wits' ends,

and to no avail. The fact remains, however, the explanation halts. Among his men, giants as many of them are, is not a hero, so far as I have found; and certainly, if we were writing a biography of heroes, not one of Shakespeare's men would find a place in the book. When the *Odyssey* is read, Ulysses is seen an intended hero. For his statue, the poem is pedestal; but does any man in Shakespeare impress us so? Sometimes we are told that Faulconbridge and King Henry V are heroes. They may be. No absolute rule for determining a hero has been prescribed. Here we wander at will, as butterflies do on sunny days. No one can say us nay to our claims, be they what they may. In both the men named possess some heroic, notable qualities, but I would never think of them as heroes. Henry is a soldier, outward bound for conquest, and is brusque and soldierlike in war and wooing, as Shakespeare has him, while the drama is fairly chanted to the tune of battle marches. All this I cheerfully concede, at the same breath insisting that Henry is somewhat lost on the field of England's growing greatness; we feel not Henry so much as we feel England, he being sword and voice, but England's sword and England's voice. For myself I cannot feel him. He never grasps me as a warrior grasps an enemy and bears him down. Columbus and Magellan and Raleigh dig their spurs into my sides till the blood starts, but Henry might be a paper man for all his might with me. He sailed with England over seas and conspired with her triumph, but Shakespeare is playing a triumphal march, not for the king but for the kingdom. Henry is not so impressive as king as he was as Prince Hal. The king has lost in blood and heart, and gained in statesmanship. My feeling, as well as my thinking, dissent to Henry being counted Shakespeare's hero or any other body's hero, for that matter. He is soldier like Marc Antony saving in this, Antony stirs the blood, while Henry is almost sedative. He is aware he is now a king, and his self-consciousness warps his courtesy and manlier parts, and he wears it like his crown and royal garment. His dismissal of Falstaff is so cold, so kingly in its heartlessness as to make us resent it for Falstaff's sake, not as loving him, but that we feel the perfidy of the king even as the sad Falstaff did. His

forgetfulness is so utilitarian that his face is in eclipse. He may not rank as hero for the heart.

One might have expected Julius Cæsar to be hero, since he was most apt for such a part of all the men who take rank in these dramas, when, digging deep into the play, we find our theory disconcerted by the presentation in that most of Cæsar's career is presented in epilogues, Antony or Cassius telling of it in strict seclusions or on the house top of the Forum; and on the face of this past master of the Roman world is scarce the glow of triumph, not to say the proud light of a premeditated hero. Or, if there be a hero among his men, not Hamlet nor Faulconbridge nor Henry V nor Prospero is he, but Falstaff, whom, if Shakespeare did not love and linger over as over no other man he has fashioned, I miss his bearing utterly.

If Shakespeare, however, exalted no man into the heaven of heroes, neither did he show antipathy toward any man. He was without favorites, so far as touches his ecstasy over any or special pleading for any. We may put the case thus—Shakespeare enjoyed all almost alike and was disinterested in attitude toward all his creations, unless there be a shadow of favor for Falstaff, for I cannot drown my conviction that, into the minute working out of the jesting Sir John, Shakespeare put an enjoyment unknown to any male character in his plays. He is without favorites in the sense that he was unfair with none, representing each as he was. He enjoyed men and women, and admired genius, achievement, thought, love; but I defy anybody to say whether he loved Othello or Iago more. I lean to believing he loved Iago more. Yet, why waste guesses? This is simple surmise. Thackeray loved Becky Sharpe better than anyone in *Vanity Fair*, she being the one and only one at whom he did not poke fun. She was dangerous as a poisoned stiletto. Can we tell what thing he created pleased Michael Angelo most? His frescoes, or his David, or Moses, or Dawn, or the sky-dome of St. Peter's? So we cannot tell with any assurance what man Shakespeare liked most. He treats all fairly, and is as courteous as Raleigh to each of them; but bias toward any is barely visible, if at all—certainly not so visible as that any may assert, "This man

he favors and this he dislikes." He detests nobody, not Iachimo nor Angelon or Iago. In Shakespeare is nothing vindictive as in Dante, who with a grim urbanity lifts his friends into heaven and drops his enemies into hell—a procedure touched with a baleful humor, though Dante was not cognizant of it. He was too severe to be just. Those who expatriated him must be damned as certainly as if God had decreed the sentence. That unsmiling poet had made a grim potentate whose ears had been deaf to petitions for mercy and whose acts had been maledictions. Shakespeare has neither hell nor paradise; he has earth, and his men are here and only here, for King Hamlet is a ghost at best, and his voice is husky and his words inept and sorely uncertain. Shakespeare is no advocate; he is fashioner. What does he think of Hamlet? Nobody knows. Is he making sport of him, or castigating him, or pitying him, or enthroning him? Does he think Marc Antony a fool to barter away a world for a woman's kiss, or does he envy him? Who knows? What does he think of Shylock? Does he favor Shylock or Antonio? This Shakespearean faculty of expressing no preference is astonishing and without parallel. Ask him to tell whom he prefers and he will smile at us, as at a foolish child, and will make no answer. The truth is, the artist is dominant in him, and he enjoys his men because they are men and for no other reason. Life delights him, as it does kittens and birds. The self-explication of a soul is what charms him. Momsen hates Cicero, and deifies Cæsar; but Shakespeare will have no demigods, and will maintain so absolute an impartiality as that we cannot break through his reserve. What he at any moment has delights him as a child is delighted alternately with doll and picture book and drawing with colored chalks and playing school and writing expectant letters to Santa Claus; and that is the end of what we may safely say of Shakespeare's preference. Caliban and Ariel and Prospero and shipwrecked king and raging seas flecked with *débris* of wreck and Miranda and Ferdinand—all are dear to him as children to a sire.

In "Henry VIII" strict impartiality and absolute truthfulness are exemplified in a striking manner. Whether the drama was written during the life of Elizabeth or in the reign of

James is not material, inasmuch as to neither of these sovereigns would extolling Katharine be palatable. Plainly a courtier's task would have been to have glossed the ruffian coarseness of Henry VIII, for he was Elizabeth's father, and to have painted in colors unfadingly glowing the character of Anne Boleyn, for she was Elizabeth's mother. Who composed this play was not a courtier, meant though it is to glorify Elizabeth. If ever a poet was under bonds to be fulsome in praise and full of innuendo toward those who were antagonists to the reigning sovereign, Shakespeare was such poet, when he wrote this triumphal ode to Queen Elizabeth. What to expect under the circumstances we readily see, which expected thing is precisely what does not happen, for Henry is not lauded, but stands out all but totally unlovely. His vices announce themselves in his face. His brutality, heartlessness, concupiscence, repugnant egotism, and autocracy all blossomed in him, so that to even an imperfect sight they are apparent. Shakespeare does neither adorn nor praise him, but holds him up in naked blameworthiness, to speak and answer for himself. We had supposed Katharine had been blamed, would be belittled by look or gesture, for such treatment the case apparently imperatively demands, whereas, instead, she is pictured one of the sweetest women whose heart ever knelt to kiss a husband's hand. Her words, soaked with tears, are honey-sweet, and she stands as if she were the queen of grief, nor ever in her days of pomp and circumstance was she so queenly. How more than strange such presentation in one who is telling a story for the ears of those whose fortunes are grown out of the grave of her calamities. And Anne Boleyn is not lauded; rather she is discovered to be a weak, vain woman, selfish and lacking in moral stamina, yet human and feminine, and she stands in shamed contrast with Katharine. If this be not anomalous in him who is lauding her daughter, I do not know the meaning of anomaly. In painting Wolsey, we who loathed him when Queen Katharine turns her tear-dimmed eyes full on his face and with her quivering woman's lips calls him her enemy set to do her hurt—this spent glory that once was premier puissant we pity, and execrate his master as ingrate and unkingly; and this Elizabeth's father so dethroned.

from our respect and love. These remarks may serve to justify the claim that Shakespeare was "without partiality and without hypocrisy."

Nor has Shakespeare a specifically good man. Edgar, Pericles, Prospero, Valentine of the "Two Gentlemen of Verona," Kent, Horatio, Leonatus are clean men and wholesome. So is Hamlet. That they are contrived for good men, however, would never suggest itself to a careful reader. Shakespeare has bad men, weak men, execrable men, men of prodigal genius, dominant personalities, whirlwinds of power and conquest, laudable men, men not evil, negatively good men; but good men, such as might sit for a picture of goodness, as Colonel Newcome, there is not one of, or, if there be, I know not who he is. Shakespeare is not in this sense moral in purpose. The great moral contentions never wrought havoc in his soul, as fierce armies on a battle ground. The Puritan rectitude and duty did not thrill him to the center. Milton, poet of duty, had not been palatable to Shakespeare, I think, and certainly had not been comprehensible; while, to have pivoted two epics on sin and sin's conquest over man, or sin and man's conquest over sin, as Milton did in "Paradise Lost" and "Paradise Regained," or as Bunyan did in "Pilgrim's Progress," is unthinkable of him. Intense moral earnestness is not apparent in him. Those throes which make the travail of a mountain's birth frivolous in comparison belong not to this wide-horizoned dramatist. Raleigh and Shakespeare are brothers of one house in their reflection of their generation, and they glow as a city illuminated on a gala night. They did not take religion too much to heart, leastwise not in such fashion as to create earthquake shocks of moral and political upheavals and revolutions and renovations, or lead them with laughing hearts to the martyr's flames. They are, in short, children of their era, and look as if they had been fathered by the Greek gods. I do not suggest that Shakespeare's dramatic bias was immoral. That is remotest from what he is. His was a genius-perception that evil told against the evildoer; but, whether he ever approved goodness as goodness and for its own sake, I for one cannot tell, but gravely doubt. He is the exact contrary of being immoral.

I have found him one of the cleanest writers in all literature. He has no rejoicing in filth and pruriency and debauchery. Coarse he was, when measured by our higher standards, because he did not wholly rise—though he rose far—above his age in this regard. He is no voluptuary; is always sensuous—as Milton would have the poet be—but never sensual. I do not impugn Shakespeare nor his motive; I only hold to the atmosphere of his poetry in insisting on his inability to conceive goodness in such measure and with such regard as appears in the literature of our century; for indeed, that view-point belongs to our century and not to his. Free will he knew and believed in; vice he saw and knew; virtue he beheld and pictured; but, as to what he thought of the two, his reticence remains, and a good man like Job there is no trace of in Shakespeare, or that he ever thought of such a man is dubious. By this phrase "good man" I understand a man whose controlling impulse is God and who would honestly translate him into the common vernacular of life. Such a man Shakespeare never did portray, nor in my judgment, could have done so, had he tried. In him is always apparent a tidal movement against vice and for virtue. He knew the soul's life too intimately to defy conscience or deny a single stab of its envenomed sword, but such attitude is far removed from a determinate and glowing allegiance to love and God and a career of human betterment. Nor must we confound his justice element with the question now under consideration. To this justice idea he was always true, just as sunlight would be true to tell the whole story of any figure taken in a picture. In Angelo, of "Measure for Measure," we note this love of and fealty to justice. In Richard III, whose conscience, pinioned and gagged by day, is free and tempest-toned by night; in Macbeth's growing and childish credulity on the one side and his bloody tournament with murdered Banquo on the other; in the grim soldier justice with which Bardolph and Nym are hung as common thieves, while enlisted soldiers fighting for England in foreign wars—though we have spent many an idle hour in hearing and seeing them in revels with obese Sir John—and Pistol, the braggart coward, is let slink home a pimp and vagabond and parasite; and most of all in

Falstaff—lord of laughter and penetrative jest—who by and by falls to the shamed level of being a booby tricked by country wives, in these we see how just as fate Shakespeare was. He would not sin against the central verities; though to love a man like Bunyan or even Edmund Spenser—idealizing virtue in his music-making rhymes—is not in him. No man of simple, sweet, human goodness ever walked onto Shakespeare's stage and had his coronation.

Shakespeare's men are sufficient to the point of greatness. As characters they are superb. He has slighted no one of them, having done like the builders of mediæval cathedrals, who finished every part, however remote, concealed, insignificant, with laborious detail and skill. Each man stands full height himself. This is true of his women as well, as will witness any of the delineations, selecting at random. Are not the merry wives of Windsor as clearly disclosed in personality as Ophelia or as complete a portrait as Rosalind? This accuracy goes further. Launce and his dog Crab are as minute engravings as Romeo. Never was beast more completely identified with man than here, and as between owner and dog we are apt to enjoy the scrubby dog the more, and—as not unfrequently occurs—whatever we think of the master, we admire the cur. Shakespeare was as painstaking as Balzac, with this difference—the difference between talent and genius. Balzac is always taking pains, Shakespeare is never taking pains, yet is as encyclopedic in attention to details of finish as if he has passed years in study of that single object of creation. Shakespeare is as a gifted speaker whose words flow out beautiful and abundant as light and with no more effort. A painter could, as I suppose, paint a likeness of any person validly introduced into the plays as readily as if the subject sat before him, so sufficient are the lines of face and figure of character; as, for instance, the murderers in Macbeth, who are much more than voice and shadow, with murderous intent and execution, with spiteless but venomous thrust. Two murderers have this cursed business in their hands, when, at the bloody tryst, appears an unanticipated third, and, though he is in darkness and his face is hid and name unknown, and his voice never poised above a hoarse whisper, we see him as in a lurid light.

Whoever he is, leadership and a stony, settled purpose are in him, and his face is hard, his eyes cold, his lips tightened together in spiteless and unpitying determination when the horses' hoofs make merry on the darkened road up which the unsuspecting victim rides. And Hubert in "King John," premeditated ruffian to burn out sweet Arthur's eyes—why he is visible as dawn, so that an artist could paint him as if a hundred sittings had been afforded. In Shakespeare is the efficiency of the mighty artists, who, with a few strokes of the brush, limn a face with accuracy and illumination. Kipling has this gift in a high degree; but Shakespeare is without peer in this field, as in many others. Cordelia, in the tragedy of "King Lear," is given slighter heed than the king's fool. She appears, is angered at her sisters' hypocritical protestations of love, speaks to the angering of her father, is driven from his presence by the whirlwind of his wrath, is wedded to the king of France, comes back with an army to win back Lear's crown for him, bends above her father's sleeping face what time she wooes him back from madness, and is borne dead by the decrepit, winter-white Lear back from her death. "The rest is silence," and yet she suffuses the play as crimson light, the skies and clouds and waves on summer evenings. Any artist can see her, and, if he fail in painting her, the failure arises not because he does not see her with all sufficiency. She sits as throned in sunlight, and she was only a fair, girl shadow passing across our path in timorous haste.

And the grave diggers in "Hamlet," yokels as they are, we feel acquainted with them as if they had been our neighbors many years. Their pithy and unfeeling words might drop from lips much more modern than themselves. The scene is unique, and they preempt the scene as a bride preempts attention at a marriage, for Hamlet is a lesser figure than they while he holds converse with them, they filling the hour even as they occupy the grave. The grave making ready for the fair Ophelia, the growing mound of damp earth their spades are making; their jesting talk, their cloddy indifference to the heartbreak of the occasion; their decision gravely reached that, seeing "the crowner hath set on her, and finds it Christian burial," they may with clear conscience dig her grave; the

apostrophe to the spade and to themselves; the proposal of a conundrum—which in anybody should be accounted one of the cardinal sins; one calling to the other in mandatory voice, "Fetch a stoup of liquor," his singing a rude love ditty while he lightly throws out the earth and therewith a skull which, after much badinage, Hamlet finds to be "Yorick's skull, the king's jester"—have done, do we not know the grave diggers so as to hear, see, feel them? Or the witches in "Macbeth," with their hellbroth brewing, their hairy chins, their crooked beaks, their ferret eyes, their maudlin, devilish words, their crafty imposition on superstitious, gullible general Macbeth fresh from his rout of the king's enemies, ugh! they make us shudder; come away! Shakespeare, thou art the chief magician, and thy revels are never ended.

The contagious quality for Shakespeare is mastery. I do not think we can mistake him here. He wants characters to be princes in what they do, demands imperiously that each be masterful. Competency, control, and sufficiency are his trinity of character virtues. He enjoys, as Phidias might, the frame and muscles of Hercules and the beauty-dower of lovely Venus, each adequate and satisfactory. Characters must be at one with themselves; nothing must be out of joint. Be they bad as king Claudius or foolish, mooning, and simpering as Malvolio, or friend like Friar Laurence, or coarse like the old nurse to Juliet, or vociferously churlish as Apemantus, or envious as Cassius, or idealizing and duped as Brutus, or sycophant like Oswald, or king's tool like Rosencrantz, or politic as Polonius, or scheming and wicked as Cymbeline's queen, or fond like Bianca, or sultry in passion like Cleopatra, or vile like Boult, or chaste like Marina, or just like Duke Vincento, or rebellious as Caliban, or headstrong and rash as Harry Hotspur, or crushed into the sheer poesy of sorrow like Richard II, or consequential as Dogberry, or fool as Quince, or fantastical like Don Armado, or melancholy, as Jaques, or witty as Touchstone, or poetic like Lorenzo, or patriotic as Faulconbridge, or shrewd like Petruchio, or unlovely like Bertram, or insanely jealous like king Leontes—each is coherent. No one falsifies himself, no one is obscure. Each stands a chief personality in the delineation. Shakespeare demands of each

that he be himself, full-grown. The idiotic magistrate as Dogberry must be full idiot, the swashbucket as Sir Tody must be roystering as a carnival night. Shakespeare will have all his men and women life-size. Is not his unrevealed motto—and we can fairly hear him now command as in a general's imperious tone—"Show what you are;" from which there is no appeal?

In a crude way the following groups may include Shakespeare's men: The fool, the child, the statesman, the politician, the soldier, the aristocrat, Falstaff, the pessimist, the optimist, men of the baser sort, the men of pathos, the men of honor, the friend, the lover, the man of duty, the men in whom conscience, after one fashion or another, operates. Under the caption of "fools" are to be included the clown in "Twelfth Night," Touchstone, Malvolio, Quince, Bottom, Dogberry, Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Launce, Justice Shallow, and Justice Silence, with the fool in "Lear" and Hamlet as jester. Now the calling these names shows two classes of fools, namely, the intentional and the unintentional, or the fool from plenty of sense, and the fool from paucity of sense. Nobody is so humorous and ludicrous as the person who never sees himself humorous nor feels himself ridiculous. He is solemn as a ghost, he never goes, as the pitcher's balls are sometimes said to, in curves, but in straight lines and, like the leading carriage in a funeral procession, turns street corners at abrupt angles. We feel as if we were chummy with a hearse, when he is near. He eschews jest as an irrelevancy, and espouses seriousness as a profession. He is funnier than jokes, and never suspects it, nor could be persuaded. Some are humorous because they do not know to be sensible—as a youth enamored of himself with pompous egotism wedging himself into all occasions, with stilted speech and foppish manners and excess of style in make-up, with monocle and jejune mustache and bull terrier following as if himself cast a shadow, rouses all our risibilities, gives us fits of laughter from which we fear we may not recover, while he remains sober as a photograph, never doubting that he excites wonder akin to awe. With this unintentionally jocose soul belong Quince and Bottom and Dogberry and Sir Toby and Sir Andrew and Malvolio and Justice Shallow and Justice Silence. The other class of

fools is never fool, but always brainy, alert as an Indian on guard in war time, keen as a razor-edged sword. Such fools make laughter, as a skilled artificer. They use us, we cannot use them. They are edged tools, with which to meddle is probably to lose some blood. Call him by what name we will —wit, humorist, laughter-monger, merrymaker, the cause or the excuse of laughter—he is still our superior and in part our enemy. In him is an intellectual ascendency and a meaning we know not quite what. The one class was fool from scarcity, the other from excess, of brains. In this latter class belong the clown in "Twelfth Night," King Lear's fool, Hamlet in his saturnine humor, and, as I think, Touchstone.

Singularly enough, among Shakespeare's women are no fools, nor on the contrary are there any humorists, unless Beatrice in "Much Ado about Nothing" be a single exception. Beatrice and Benedick are constantly crossing swords in repartee, but, for myself, I confess to seeing in her only an excess of what I may term feminine priggishness. She does not, as appears to me, so much say cute things, merry things, as pert things, tart things. Instead of a fund of good humor, with its fine bead on the liquor of her words and laughter, there is rather in her soul an unconscious discontent looking for vent. What she has not, namely, a lover, she affects to despise—a trick some women have not forgotten to this hour. I may be wrong, for these are so largely matters of opinion for which no solid reason can be given, but I am not entertained nor yet stung to laughter by her jest. She impresses me as ill-supplied with good nature, though entirely unconscious that she is so, and is studied in her rejoinders, as one who plays a part without the art to hide that she is conscious. She had the repute of being witty, and felt she must live up to her reputation at whatever hazard, but when in love she has found her heart and ceases to rail, and her sarcasm sleeps, being possessor of a happy heart. Beatrice is not therefore an exception to the rule of Shakespeare's presentation of women without humor. Benedick's words have by far the finer flavor; they are always in admirable temper, and he is parrying, not making, thrusts, is spontaneous as laughter, and full of good humor as Democritus.

The child is Arthur in "King John," and we love him and cannot help it. Shakespeare's children were girls, and possibly in his secret heart was a man's longing for a son, a "lyttel tyke" to follow him along the Avon lanes and through the bustle of the London streets. Certain we are that upon the child Arthur he has poured a very sky of tenderness. Arthur with his child's treble, his winsome ways and words, his art to worm his way into our heart and we not know it, his soft and tearful and unsophisticated childish pleading, his persuasiveness, his cogency of argument, because he is a child and gifted a pleader by the God of little children—these are portrayed with such economy of words and lavishness of idea and suggestion as are indigenous to Shakespeare. Small wonder, therefore, if the child by the tears in his voice and the dear pleading of his arms about Hubert's neck puts out the glow upon the iron and makes it passionless as earth. That Shakespeare loved little children, and that his eyes carressed them as they passed him on the street or lane, no reader of "King John" can ever question.

The statesman is Cardinal Wolsey. Cæsar, though the chief statesman of the Roman race, is not pictured as statesman in Shakespeare's play. Wolsey is alone, lacking in the politic, stalwart in his power and genius, the dominator of kings, haughty, imperious, opulent, sagacious, ambitious, and yet a creature to be put down or up at a gross king's whim, and in his fall more the prince than in his pomp of premiership.

The politicians are Henry Bolingbroke, Marc Antony in his harangue at Cæsar's funeral, and Polonius. The character of Bolingbroke is luminously sketched. Bowing low from his prancing steed, saying, "Your servant, countrymen," selfish, peevish, courting favor assiduously as any lover, veneered, being all things to all men if by all means he might fool some—that was Bolingbroke. Polonius is the shrewd soul, not quite statesman but full-grown politician, skilled in diplomacy, a magazine of precedents, lacking the creative faculty and instinct, whose business is politics rather than policies, crafty but not astute, never doubting himself, penetrating all others, never guessing he is looked through like glass, intent on subserviency to his chief, and, when he hides in the queen's

boudoir to ravish Hamlet of his secret, is slain by the quick, chance thrust of Hamlet's suspicious and angry sword. So ends this politician.

The soldier is Henry V, rather than Antony or Faulconbridge, though Faulconbridge rather than Antony, and Edmund rather than either. Military prowess and accomplishment are in Edmund. He is aglitter like a knight in battle harness, and is possessed of fire, audacity, ability to mass men and hurl them on to victory and lead them back with spoils and banners and captives, but is lost in the movement of the tragedy of which he is so bad and great a part. Henry is the truer soldier portrait. No defeat clouds his campaigns; his trophies are crowns and wife and kingdoms. Henry thinks himself a soldier, and as a soldier wooes. The soldier at home in the infernal din of battle, groans, and charge, and wild huzza is what Shakespeare has made Henry to appear.

Falstaff is a class by himself. He has no brothers. No hint can do him justice. His case must be argued at length, like a pending treaty. He is king of laughter, so that when he jests the whole world must keep silent. He is the American humorist, before America gave a jester birth. As himself saw, he was cause of humor in others, provoking brilliancy from very clods, the versatile, ten-thousand-sided man whose huge bulk "lards the lean earth as he walks along" and whose amazing wit plays on all about him as if they were pipes whose every stop he knew and was full master of. Huge in boast and impudence and laughters and bestialities and persuasions with men and women, say now for this arch-jester only this—Nobody has ever come in bowshot of his humor. Even yet the world's sides ache with laughter at his jests and him.

The pessimists are Gloucester, in "King Lear," and Shylock and Timon and Apemantus and Cassius, hater of Cæsar, and Jaques, in "As You Like It." Practically, all shades of pessimist mood are presented in these persons. Jaques is incipient pessimistic, being melancholy and suspicious and dreamy in his views of things; he sees, or thinks he sees, the shadows chasing sunlight from the hills. If he change not nor die, he will by and by be misanthrope. Gloucester is in

nothing amiable. A coarse man, speaking lewdly of the mother of his son, steered by no governing motive pure and strong, he becomes attempted suicide in his calamities. Apemantus raves to hear himself, Timon curses because he does not hear himself. He had been lavish and foolish; now he is splenetic, turbulent, unreasoning, revengeful, and misanthropist. Both moods are insane. Shylock hates them that despise him, and his heart so pants for vengeance as that his hand plays with the knife for utter love of it. He had occasion for his anger, but vengeance is best left to God; and vengeance is pessimism grown to fruit. Cassius is cold as ice, bitter as winter, and using every man in range of him as hand and knife to stab his enemy, whom he hates for the good reason that this Cæsar has won applause and popularity and glory and Cassius plays a lesser part. Cassius is egotism that exalts itself to heaven in estimation, and is selfishness in full and poisonous flower. In this company legitimately fall the suicides, who are Romeo, Cassius, Brutus, and Othello. Romeo had with his equatorial nature loved to distraction, had wedded, and now, standing at the tomb of his beloved Juliet, finds the day pitch-dark about him. His broken heart says the day is dead with Juliet—there can be no more light—and that is the full mood of pessimism. Lost hope is a life in ruins. Hope must not die. Duty Romeo had not seen, for he was one to whom that word had made no loud appeal, and such a man is blighted while in gorgeous bloom; so it happens his impulse controls him and goads him to drink the poisoned cup. Cassius—stoic and pessimist, his plans defeated, his ambition slain but not dead, his envy in nothing abated—thinks death a lesser evil than to meet his conqueror. In pessimism is little real courage. To live under adverse stars is odds harder than to die. Suicide is rank moral cowardice. Brutus, carried away with his enthusiasm for liberty, finds himself the dupe of Cassius who has used him as his dagger to work his envy's spite, finds Cæsar truly "dead as earth" but the republic as dead as Cæsar, finds Antony his conqueror, and, what is worse, far worse, finds his dreams all dead; and his eyes are dim, he can see no whither save only the road for his dagger to his heart. Othello had lost faith, then Desdemona,

then had found himself poor dupe of cunning Iago, and leaps toward his suicide as swimmer toward the flood. When God has died to any soul, suicide is the quick way out of life's tragedy.

Shakespeare's optimists are really one, and he, Prospero. Faulconbridge might pass for company, if one would stretch a point, but he was rather loyal, unquestioning soldier-follower than schooled optimist. What Hamlet missed of being by his scowling attitude, that Prospero was. Robbed of his kingdom, he had his daughter and his books, and therein found a kingdom spacious as the skies. He had outlived hate, was calm, and so a calmer of the angry waters, scientist, and knew the art to make Caliban and Ariel do his bidding, schooled to endure adversity with a smiling face and beat back ruin with a laughing heart, self-poised, mage, master of himself and so of others, a man who refused to be conquered or handicapped by fate, but with his undaunted courage and his books found recovery and kingdom.

Shakespeare's aristocrat is Coriolanus, and is aristocrat life-size. He is a glowing portrait. His stout words of hate against the canaille are still hot in the air. Coriolanus was a soldier, a hero scarred with many battles for the State, and he hates the crowd nor loves their cheers, nor feels their curses. He is a graphic working out of this attitude toward society, the attitude that calls folks cads and lavishes fulsome love upon itself. Never was aristocrat so clearly seen, so aptly delineated. Into this character, I take it, Shakespeare poured the acidity himself had seen in aristocracies. Doubtless he had felt the lash of that inferiority that boasts itself in blood, and a great name not made but inherited. He is very caustic in that he lets the littleness and bigotry of Coriolanus blaze out so as to obscure his valor and exploits and hurl him headlong to treason. Aristocratic pride is cheap and little. Worth is God's merit mark. Coriolanus should have known that worth makes the man—himself or another—and that aristocracies and democracies both have their weaknesses and wickedness, and as between the two the common man is the conserver of the safety of the world. He was hysterical and self-conscious as a foolish girl.

The men of the baser sort are Cloten, Pandarus, Claudio, Angelo, Iachimo, King John, Richard III, Claudius, Oswald, Edmund the bastard, and Iago—not to mention those moral scullions, Falstaff, Nym, Pistol, and their ilk. Macbeth shall be mentioned in another company, though he belongs here too. Bad men belong in many classes. Iago was pessimist, and might have found classification there, but that his more legitimate ranking was with the basest of the base. Cassius belongs here; but, among pessimists, he felt so altogether at home, I thought to make him cheerful after his gloomy fashion, and so placed him there. Cymbeline was perilously near being a base man because weakness, culpable weakness, differentiates itself with difficulty from badness and baseness. A word to these brothers in wickedness. Cloten, son of Cymbeline's queen, is first coarse, then ambitious in what requires no manliness nor manly effort, then criminally weak, then base and brutal. Pandarus is paid go-between of lust and love, and has come to such shamed eminence as that his name is written in the world's lexicon as "pander," a minister to lust. Claudio is brother to the chaste, immaculate Isabella; and when his sister's virtue is assailed by Angelo, the duke's deputy, and this foul ruler makes the sister's virtue the price of the brother's freedom and life, Claudio, fearing death, asks Isabella to prostitute herself that he may live. Few conceptions in Shakespeare are more fiercely and mightily wrought out than this, and Claudio is damned to all the ages. Angelo is ruler who makes rigid laws against vice, and himself holds not back from any lust, and will stop at no violence to compass his will, and is so base as that no pleading from chaste lips nor tears from chaste eyes nor eloquence of purity and heartbreak can move him; and he is dead and his name rots. Iachimo is in some regards, to my fancy, the vilest man in Shakespeare, in that he, without a shadow of reason, does the foulest thing possible to a man, namely, blemishes a spotless woman's name, and that with her husband. A wager did it. Wagers are vicious and vice-producing. Iachimo affects to have access to Imogen's room and person, describes her boudoir and her breast so that silly and mean Leonatus—for in this he was less than man that he would put his wife's vir-

tue to a wager, but so still does gambling hold nothing sacred —is deceived, and Iachimo lets him stay deceived and rest in the belief his wife is lewd. Can any man be viler than Iachimo? King John is the impotent meanness and rage of a small mind set in high places. Richard III—as Shakespeare fashions him, I do not now raise the question of the historical accuracy of the portrait—is a powerful and wicked mind turning all its resources of statecraft, cunning, courage, and imperial will toward the single task of self-aggrandizement. King Claudius is a man weak in all but wickedness. Oswald is sycophant and pusillanimous. Edmund is a man of military carriage, fascinating to women, dissatisfied, ambitious, villainous, heartless when his own interests are jeopardized by kindliness, a self-sympathizer, a murderer of a brother's good name so that he may become his father's favorite and heir, giver-over of his father to the charge of treason so he may seize his estates and this with a courtly semblance of virtue which might make Iago envious; and, dying, spitting out with his life's blood

> Some good I mean to do,
> Despite of mine own nature,

and with his selfishness still regnant in him, seeing by report that Goneril and Regan are dead, and for love of him,

> Yet Edmund was beloved:
> The one the other poisoned for my sake,
> And after slew herself.

Iago is patron saint of villains and hypocrites. Words are lost on him. His guilt is black like Erebus. He is so deep a hypocrite as to deceive himself, which is the last infamy of hypocrisy and becomes its suicide. Only Guido in Browning's powerful drama is worse than Iago. So stands he in a foul preeminence.

The men of pathos are such as Wolsey—for whom no words now—and Lear and Richard II and Henry VI; and they three are kings! Is this design of Shakespeare to make his men of tears all sovereigns? Can kings weep and come to ashes as their sweetest morsel? So say these kings with broken voices and humbled looks, that used to be so high. Richard moaning,

I am sworn brother, sweet,
To grim Necessity, and he and I
Will keep a league till death.
. . . . .
And must I ravel out
My weaved-up folly?
. . . . .
Mine eyes are full of tears, I cannot see,

is very pitiful. And Henry is full brother in this grief. As Henry's father's father had uncrowned Richard, so now he is uncrowned, and Richard and Henry across the years reach trembling and unsceptered hands and say with tear-choked voice, "Brothers we, kinsmen in grief." And Lear—with his eighty years and past of snowfall on him and his dear, misprized Cordelia in his arms and he with voice metal-hard rasping, "Cordelia, stay a little," and then sobbing, with a drooping voice,

She's dead as earth.
. . . . .
Now she's gone forever!
Cordelia, Cordelia! stay a little.
. . . . .
Thou'lt come no more,
Never, never, never, never, never!—

well may Edgar say—no words of ours—"Very bootless."

Hamlet and Othello and Valentine are Shakespeare's men of honor. Hamlet was eager to be honor's self, but knew not how. Othello is not the tragedy of jealousy, as many think, but is the tragedy of wounded honor. He was a soldier, and soldiers hold honor above all beside. Othello loved with a wild, true heart, it is true, but behind this is his sense of being shamed in Desdemona, and his hot haste of honor slew him and her. He presents the fatuity of honor. His soldier mind upset his husband sense and fidelity of love. Valentine's is honor's noble and spotless self.

Some sweet friends are shaped in Shakespeare; and no wonder, if he who wrote the "Sonnets" for love of friend should from his heart's deep loves make friendship beautiful upon the stage. Enobarbus, in "Antony and Cleopatra," friend to Antony; Menenius, friend to hot-blood Coriolanus; Pisanio at once servant and fast, true friend of posthumous

Leonatus and Imogen; Marc Antony, Cæsar's friend and eulogist—and for such a eulogium from such a friend who might not endure to die?—and Horatio. And Horatio? Who that loves loves not.

Horatio? Hamlet trusted him as I fear me he did not trust God, and left him legacy

> Absent thee from felicity awhile
> To tell my story.
> . . . . . .
> Had I but time—as this fell sergeant, death,
> Is strict in his arrest—O I could tell you—
> But let be. Horatio, I am dead;
> Thou livest; report me and my cause aright
> To the unsatisfied.

The rest is silence, and his last look lingers on Horatio's face, and with a voice stained with tears Horatio whispers, "Now cracks a noble heart; good night, sweet prince."

The lovers are Duke Orsino, seeming fickle but surely true, Orlando, lover of Rosalind, and a more welcome and comely lover woman never would wish to love; Valentine, spotless gentleman from Verona, whose love was like himself true as the stars and white like their light; Romeo, a tempest of bewildered passion; Marc Antony, mad with love, checkmated by his heart, slave of that haunting voluptuousness named Cleopatra, fond enough to lose an empire and think nothing lost, and feeling his wounded way to Cleopatra's tower to die upon her heart and with her kisses on his lips; posthumous Leonatus, true in love to lovely Imogen, but weak in trust of her; King Leontes, ridiculous in his distrust of stately Hermione; Othello, who loved Desdemona with all the fervor of his tropic race; Lorenzo with his poet speech—these are royal lovers, and glow like crimson skies that will not fade.

Hamlet is the man of duty, and essentially he is the one man who is so presented, unless we except Kent in "Lear," who to my thought is rather the faithfulness of the courtier than the worker out of sober duty. But Hamlet is trying to find out what his duty is and do it. He did not find it out, and did not do it; but the man's futile endeavors, his colloquies with ghost and king and queen and himself to find where duty lay are sufficient to wake my pity and my tears.

He haunts me as his father's ghost does not. His was a solitary search for duty, and only in his dying throes did he behold his opportunity for which his life had waited. Pity Hamlet for his endeavor's sake.

In strident tones, like wind on winter seas driving through rigging of a ship scudding before the gale, conscience speaks in Richard III and in Macbeth. When Richard sleeps, conscience menaces him like lightning swords; when Macbeth wakes, conscience turns the intrepid soldier into a quaking voice and fear-whitened face and ghastly look at the empty but bloody chair of Banquo, and he calls so that the dinner feast is quite undone, calls with pallor in his very words,

> You cannot say I did it:
> Shake not your gory locks at me.

In Lady Macbeth and King Macbeth conscience rises to its noon.

The time is spent, and more. This Shakespeare's world of men cannot be summoned and arrayed, as in a line of march, in such brief space. But they are mighty, and their name is legion, and they grow on the imagination like the height of midnight skies.

W. A. Knight.

Art. III.—SCHOLASTIC REALISM AND SOME OF ITS BEQUESTS TO THEOLOGICAL THINKING.

As every student of philosophy knows, "realism" in the scholastic sense is not properly antithetic to "idealism" but to "nominalism." It stands for the conclusion that we are not dealing with mere names or conventional signs when we mention "universals"—general terms, designations of classes, names significant of species and genera, such as "wisdom," "man," "bird," "animal," "body," "color." In all instances of this kind, it holds, we are dealing with objective realities. To speak succinctly, scholastic realism has to do with the nature and functions of universals, and represents an emphatic position in favor of their reality, their actual existence in an objective range or apart from the human mind in its act of contemplating them.

The mediæval scholastics found an historic basis for their realistic doctrine in Platonism, or in Aristotelianism, or in a combination of the two. As commonly understood, Plato was an advocate of the most emphatic and unqualified realism. Before the individuals of like name he placed the universal; before concrete entities, the ideas. He regarded the latter as eternal and imperishable archetypes, uniform and self-identical realities; whereas, individual things belong to the sphere of mutation, and depend for the measure of reality which they do possess, as well as for their cognizability, upon participation in the universal essences, the ideas. So Plato has been generally understood to have taught. Lotze makes the suggestion that Plato was badly served in this relation by the Greek language, as failing to afford suitable means of discrimination between "validity" and "subsistence;" that what he wished to insist upon was not the independent subsistence of ideas, but their unconditioned validity—the fact of an ideal order or system which abides in its truth quite independent of any expression in the sphere of sensible and concrete reality, the perfect and unassailable integrity of thought-distinctions over against the flux characteristic of all finite things.* However,

*Logik, pp. 501-506.

the verdict that Plato conceived of the ideas as substantial entities can claim a pretty good ground in the fact that a philosopher as near to him as Aristotle so judged, and also in the fact that historical critics as competent as Zeller, Erdmann, and others have pronounced very decidedly for the same conclusion.

Aristotle repudiated the theory of the independent and substantial existence of universals. The individual alone, he maintained, is entitled to be called substance. A general name is a predicate-term, not a subject-term. It is significant of an attribute, or of a complex of attributes, viewed as common to a greater or less number of individuals. There is no whiteness apart from individual white objects, and no humanity save in individual men. To name universals, therefore, is to express the common or resembling qualities of a plurality of objects. In this line of statements Aristotle seems to stand essentially on the basis of conceptualism, or the theory which makes universals expressive of concepts—mental representations of the common or (more strictly) similar in a plurality of objects. But, on the other hand, Aristotle made statements which were capable of being understood in a sense approximating not a little to Platonic realism. With Plato he taught both that individuals are known in their essential character in and through universals, and that the objects of genuine knowledge must be supposed to be real. In this way, notwithstanding his ascription of substantiality solely to individuals, he gave occasion to emphasize the superior reality of universals. A chance was afforded to one who was disposed to interpret Aristotle in favor of a somewhat stanch type of realism to do so without appearing to go far afield. If not fairly invited, this order of interpretation was not distinctly excluded. Platonism was undoubtedly the more congenial basis for a pronounced realism, but it could also find harborage among those who reckoned themselves disciples of Aristotle.

The essence of the Platonic doctrine came to be expressed in the formula *universalia ante rem*, while the characteristic feature of Aristotle's teaching in this relation was set forth in the formula *universalia in re*. These formulas may be credited with a measure of propriety as applied to the

respective ways of thinking of the two Greek philosophers. But evidently they are not fitted in themselves to serve as means of an accurate classification of realistic doctrine. It is necessary to inquire in what sense the universal is supposed to be prior to the individual thing, and in what sense it is supposed to be in the individual thing. As a matter of fact, pronounced realists in the middle ages had no objection to either formula. If they did not hold that universals are before the things in the manner of strictly independent entities, they did hold that they have a prior existence as the forms or patterns of things contained in the divine mind from eternity; and they were also agreed in maintaining that in an important sense they are in things. A discriminating exegesis must therefore look beyond the mere formula with which the teaching of a writer may have been associated.

It is commonly admitted that Erigena reproduced substantially the Platonic realism. He conceived of universals as real essences, superior in rank to individuals, logically prior to them, and containing the fundament of their being. As Ueberweg remarks, he seems to have hypostatized the *tabula logica*, making the degrees of abstraction to correspond with the degrees in the scale of real existence. A close approximation to the realistic teaching of Erigena was made by Anselm. He reproached contemporary nominalists for estimating *universales substantias* as mere words, and for showing themselves incapable of understanding by color anything distinct from body, or by wisdom anything distinct from the soul, being so merged in sense as to be disqualified from contemplating things sole and pure. He also represented the ideas which God thinks in the Logos as a veritable basis of the creature universe, the unchanging grounds of changing things, originals to which the things of the time-world but feebly correspond. Anselm did not indeed define his position very precisely, but such hints as he has given leave no reason to doubt that his thinking was emphatically of the realistic order. Among those who followed, William of Champeaux strongly asserted the objective reality of universals, and reduced individuals to the rank of accidental distinctions superinduced upon a common base. Fundamentally

Socrates, Plato, and the rest, as he represented, are one and the same entity, the universal, humanity, which in manifestation is diversified by certain accidental forms or characteristics. In the list of emphatic realists may be mentioned also Odo of Cambrai, Bernard of Chartres, Walter of Mortagne, and William of Auvergne.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there was somewhat of a tendency to curtail the realistic theory. This tendency may have been due in part to the growing ascendency of Aristotle in the thinking of that period. Abelard and John of Salisbury are understood to have espoused essentially the platform of conceptualism. Even such masters of orthodoxy as Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas indulged in statements which make for conceptualism rather than for any type of realism. When the former said, *Non est universale nisi dum intelligitur*,* he was certainly very far from giving expression to a realistic tenet. Language that looks in the same direction may be found with Aquinas.† However, the teaching of Aquinas shows also traces of realistic leaven. For instance, in his theory of cognition he seems to assume in things, as in some sense separable from their matter, a real existence of forms, that is, of universals in the sense of the realists. A fervent admirer thus construes the theory of the "angelic doctor" relative to the process of knowledge:

> The thing effects by means of the image-like in itself, that is the thought element, its entrance into the inner world of images, that is the circle of our thinking. Through the species as an element in the being of the thing, which element is conformable to the soul, the subject [of cognition] is placed in the soul. The soul receives the foreign form

* *Metaphys., Lib.* v, *tract.* vi, *cap.* vii. Cited by Hauréau, *Histoire de la Philosophie Scolastique*, ii, 325.

† *Dicendum, quod licet quaelibet scientia et definitio sit solum entium, non tamen oportet quod res eundem modum habeant in essendo, quem intellectus habet in intelligendo. Nos enim per virtutem intellectûs agentis abstrahimus species universales a particularibus conditionibus: non tamen oportet quod universalia praeter particularia subsistant, ut particularium exemplaria.—Sum. Theol., Pars* i, *quaest.* xliv, *art.* iii.

Creatio non dicit constitutionem rei compositae ex principiis praeexistentibus; sed compositum sic dicitur creari, quod simul cum omnibus suis principiis in esse producitur.—Sum. Theol., Pars i, *quaest.* xlv, *art.* iv.

Nomina abstracta non important res per se existentes in genere substantiae; ut humanitas nomen abstractum est, non tamen per se existit.—Cited by Hauréau, ii, 414.

without losing its own, and that is the preeminence of the cognitive being.*

Rather more explicitly than Aquinas, Duns Scotus and the Scotists paid tribute to realistic doctrine. It is true that on the one hand Scotus reproduced the Aristotelian stress upon the individual; but it is also true that he brought to the front the other side of Aristotle's teaching—his stress upon the two facts that individuals are known in their essential character through universals, and that the objects of knowledge must be supposed to be real. In construing this order of representation the "subtle doctor" seems to have assumed that, corresponding to the names of genera and species, there are objectively subsistent forms, prior in the order of generation to the individual, and constituting a nature which without detriment to its unity may be in any number of individuals. "Universal natures," says Stöckl in exposition of Scotist doctrine, "would exist, even if the understanding which thinks them should not exist. . . . Universal natures are constituted through the union of the generic and the specific form, and these forms present themselves to the understanding as objects located in nature itself, objects which are independent of the act of thinking on the part of the understanding." † Scotus may have said some things which look in the direction of a modification of this decisively realistic teaching, but it must at least be admitted that realistic doctrine finds very congenial ground in his representations.‡

In the fourteenth century a distinct revolt against realism was inaugurated by William Occam and his school. The Occamist teaching has been styled "nominalism;" but it is a fair question whether it would not be more justly denominated "conceptualism." For a time it ruled a good part of

*Otto Willmann, *Geschichte des Idealismus*, ii, 386, 387. The following is a part of the statement of Aquinas: *Cognoscentia a non-cognoscentibus in hoc distinguuntur, quia non-cognoscentia nihil habent nisi formam suam tantum, sed cognoscens natum est habere formam, etiam rei alterius; nam species cogniti est in cognoscente.*

† *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ii, 789.

‡ Stöckl, Hauréau, and Willmann agree in the conclusion that in the Scotistic formalism a very considerable approach was made to the Platonic hypostasizing of universals. Some other interpreters have understood Scotus in the sense of a less pronounced realism.

the ecclesiastical domain. Realism, however, was not effectually displaced. In a general view it appears as a prominent element in mediæval scholasticism. Even in quarters where it was not inculcated in the most open and unequivocal manner there was a tendency to admit more or less of its implications.

What now is to be thought of scholastic realism? It must be pronounced philosophically unsound. It may point to truths, but it is not true. There is absolutely no rational warrant for the real objective existence of universals, and all the analogies which are pertinent to the subject are distinctly opposed to such existence. Suppose there were in the mind of God from eternity generic and specific patterns of things to be made, what connection could these have had with real subsistence? Analogy would lead us to say not a whit more connection than a rule of action has with the act which it forecasts, or a picture with the object which it represents. A man purposing to make clothespins and ball clubs naturally fashions in his mind patterns of these things. What relation in such a case do the patterns hold to the things? Just simply that of antecedent thought-forms. They stand for a purely subjective mental function. They are in the mind and of the mind, and can no more get out of the mind into the things in any real sense than a part of the mind can be cut off and inserted into a lump of matter. The things correspond in certain respects to the patterns, because the will uses the patterns as standards or rules of action in making the things. In no proper sense are the mental patterns moved into the things, or made to reside in them, or to serve as a constitutive element of their being. The being of the things is due to the shaping, energizing will—the mental patterns serving simply as the rational antecedent, the governing rule for the agency of the will which effectuates the things. Such is the dictate of any analogy to which we can appeal. Out of the range of finite experience we can get no warrant whatever for the making of any supposed ideas or patterns in the divine mind anything more than rules of procedure for the creative divine will. For aught we know there may be in the divine mind ideas which serve as the rational antecedents of things;

there may be even ideas of as general a cast as one may be pleased to imagine; but that these ideas enter literally into the being of things, or are to be credited with any sort of objective or extra-mental subsistence, with any subsistence other than purely conceptual, there is no reason to suppose. It is slipshod thinking which ignores or minifies the gulf between the mere notions of things and things themselves.

But, it will be asked, is it not true, as Plato and Aristotle assumed, that individuals are known through universals, and that the objects of genuine knowledge must be supposed to be real? This is to be granted. If we look carefully, however, at the import of the facts in question, we shall find no justification therein of the realistic doctrine. To say that individuals are known through universals is simply to say that nothing is known in the way of absolute isolation, but rather in the way of connection or comparison with the known. Having on hand, as understood categories, such general or class terms as "animal," "rational," "volitional," "moral," "spiritual," "corporeal," "mortal," and "immortal," we proceed to define a given individual that is introduced to our attention by applying to the same these terms or as many of them as are suitable to the case. What does that signify? That the individual is veritably compounded of universals corresponding to the list of general terms mentioned? Nothing of the sort. It signifies merely that the individual is capable of being viewed in class relations and is defined to our minds by being so viewed. Intrinsically he may be individual in every atom of his being; yet if he has points of resemblance to other individuals, he can be set in relation to them on the score of these points of resemblance—in other words, be associated with them under class terms. The resemblances being real, the act of association or classification is not arbitrary, but correspondent to fact. The Platonic and Aristotelian propositions under consideration reduce, therefore, to this: The individual is defined to our thought by being viewed in class relations, and a genuine basis for so viewing him or it is supplied in his actual resemblances to other individuals. In the individual there is and can be nothing universal. Rationality in John is

purely John's capacity for rational activity. But, in so far as John is rational, he has a distinct resemblance to James and Nathan and the rest, and so in the comparing mind can be brought under a common designation with them. The universal is a matter of concept or mental representation. Conceptualism must be pronounced the true theory, it being at the same time understood that the concept expressed in a general term is not arbitrarily formed, but has respect to actual resemblances of individuals.

Using language with customary freedom, one may indeed speak of ideas as being immanent in things. As a matter of fact, philosophical writers who confess no allegiance to scholastic realism are not unaccustomed to define the continuous identity of changing things by saying that through all their changes they remain true to their immanent ideas. The language is excusable, but in strictness, as no one should need to be told, there are no ideas in the things. What is meant is that the shaping and conserving power back of things secures their conformity throughout their history to certain types or patterns.

The substance of the above discussion may be embraced in the following summary:

A general notion is no actual or possible metaphysical existence. All real existence is necessarily singular and individual. The only way to give the notion any metaphysical significance is to turn it into a law inherent in reality, and this attempt will fail unless we finally conceive this law as a rule according to which a basal intelligence proceeds in positing individuals.*

Scholastic realism being at fault in its fundamental contention, any theological structure which has been built upon it as a necessary basis must be accounted worthless. Of these structures the most notable has been reared in connection with the problem of original sin. Not all of the scholastics by any means made any direct use of the realistic postulate in their attempt to solve this problem. But some of them did. Anselm, for instance, proceeding on the common assumption of the Latin Church in that age, that Adam's sin was not merely the beginning of the depravation of the human family,

* Bowne, *Theory of Thought and Knowledge*, p. 134.

but chargeable as a matter of guilt to all the members of the race, endeavored to explain this universal guiltiness by reference to the subsistence of the whole race in the first transgressor. He admitted that the descendants of Adam were not in him in their proper personal character. But human nature, he argued, was one; it was in Adam in its entirety when he sinned; it was corrupted in its entirety by that trespass; and, as each man that is born has this nature from the start, he is justly accounted from the start a guilty sinner.* To whatever skirmishing Anselm may have resorted, he evidently assumed in this construction the substantial existence of a universal, a human nature in Adam, which was not merely Adam's nature, but literally the nature as well of his remotest descendant. Representations quite parallel to those of Anselm appear in a treatise by Odo of Cambrai.† Nor did this order of theological construction end with the palmy days of scholastic realism. Survivals of the same marvelous scheme for making men into responsible sinners in and through a transaction occurring thousands of years before their birth appear up to date. In at least two of the prominent dogmatic works published in this country within the last fifteen years a full equivalent of the Anselmic representation has place.

What has already been said may serve to indicate how this realistic doctrine of original sin rebels against philosophical interpretation. The real existence of the species, or of a general human nature in Adam—a human nature which is literally the property of all the descendants of Adam—is an artificial and unmanageable conception. How can the same identical nature, regarded as substantially existent, be literally present in a plurality of individuals? If it is counted indivisible, then we have the problem as to the possible multipresence of a finite entity—its simultaneous subsistence whole and entire in any number of subjects. Nor is this all. We have the question as to whether distinctions of personality

* *De Concept. Virg.*, vii, xxiii. *Quia natura subsistit in personis et personæ non sunt sine natura, facit natura personas infantium peccatrices. Sic spoliavit persona naturam bono justitiae in Adam; et natura egensfacta omnes personas quas ipsa de se procreat, eadem egestate peccatrices et injustos facit.*

†*De Peccato Originali, Lib.* ii.

amount to anything more than diversities in accidental properties. If human nature taken as a real entity, one and self-identical, is in every man, then it would seem to follow that any given individual of the human race is, in the whole foundation and core of his being, identical with any other individual and is distinguished from the same only superficially—the outcome to which William of Champeaux was led by his realistic premises. On that basis one ought not to say with emphasis, "I am myself," but, rather, "I am any other man plus a little surface difference." This flattening down of the significance of personality, we need not say, is something which a sober philosophy cannot regard favorably. It is the presupposition of all earnest thinking of a theistic and Christian order, that distinctions of personality are the most fundamental in the world. Men may be said to have a common nature in the sense that they are resembling personalities. To affirm that in the fundament and core of their being they are all one and the same entity styled "human nature" is to deny to them the proper uniqueness and significance of distinct personalities. If, on the other hand, the human nature primarily resident in Adam is supposed to pass literally into his descendants through partition, we have a conceit second to none in its strangeness and repulsion against all rational construction. This conceit, we judge, has not often come to open and explicit expression. The marvel is that it should ever have been entertained. Yet we find it distinctly announced by a distinguished advocate of the realistic interpretation of original sin. He makes this formal definition, "An individual is a fractional part of human nature separated from the common mass." This identifies human nature with a divisible stuff, and suggests the question how many basketfuls the pieces would make if they should be gathered up. More than this, it implies that human nature is a stuff characterized by a low degree of organization, for even sensible bodies that have any high degree of organization cannot be cut to pieces without being condemned to utter disintegration. Then, too, the question arises how a fractional part of human nature can be counted a real human nature. One would hesitate to dignify with the title of "man" a thumb which had been severed

from a human hand. By what analogy, then, shall one justify the regarding of a fractional part of human nature as a real human nature? The most drastic materialism in its attempts to construe psychical facts never made resort to a cruder conception than this of a partition of human nature into real substantial portions.

With these metaphysical shortcomings of the realistic doctrine of original sin must be joined other grounds of objection which can never cease to be weighty in the sight of a practical mind. It affronts common sense to suppose that human beings can have a responsible part in a transaction occurring before their personal conscious subsistence. The sober judgment of men leads them to except the first *stadium* even of conscious life from accountability, on the ground that newly born children have too small a dower of intelligence and self-direction to provide for responsible agency. How then shall sober judgment tolerate the notion of the responsible participation of an individual in an event that happened ages prior to his birth and which he had no more power to prevent than he had to veto the fiat of creation? Furthermore, if on realistic grounds Adam's sin is chargeable to the newly born child of this generation, then the same child is chargeable on precisely the same grounds with all the sins of those preceding him in the direct line of his ancestry; for, in any real sense in which the child was in Adam, he was in every one of his ancestors. If he bears the guilt of Adam's sin and does not bear the whole accumulated load of ancestral transgressions, it must be in virtue of a perfectly arbitrary ruling.

As not being a book of metaphysics the Bible of course gives no direct sanction to the philosophical postulate back of the realistic interpretation of original sin. Much more may be affirmed. The Bible affords no proper occasion for such an interpretation, since it does not by any means enforce belief in a responsible or guilty participation of the race in Adam's trespass. Only three or four sentences of a single biblical writer afford even a verbal basis for a belief of that sort. And one may reasonably regard himself as warned against taking these Pauline sentences in a literal fashion, when he finds that a like style of interpretation applied to parallel expressions

would shut up exegesis to the conclusion that all men actually died with Christ and have at the moment of birth in veritable possession and process of fulfillment a tolerably full ethical and religious code. The apostle, using the prerogatives of vivid religious oratory, did not stop to discriminate closely between tendency and the goal of tendency. The bad beginning in Adam tended to make men sinners, as the glorious consummation of righteous obedience in the dying Christ tended to make men die to sin. Men are born with tendencies which, left unchecked and unconquered, are quite certain to issue into the character and conduct which invite wrath, just as they are born with tendencies which in anything like a normal unfoldment lead to a recognition of the cardinal demands of the divine law.* An emphatic expression of these thoughts, an oratorical putting of tendency for a natural though not strictly necessary result is all that needs to be found in Paul's statements. To make his words go on all fours, and thus to put a meaning into them that affronts common sense, is quite gratuitous.

To guard against misunderstanding, let it be said that heredity may be a very considerable fact. Conduct, as respects one or another of its conditions, may be placed at a disadvantage in any given case by reason of some transmitted tendency. But an unavoidable inheritance, apart from a consideration of what is done with it, is never a ground for condemnation. What less than heathenish arbitrariness is it to condemn a child on the score of congenital lameness? And what difference does it make, so far as blameworthiness is concerned, whether the adverse entail appears in the visible members or is hidden among the invisible conditions of the soul's activity? Whether it be in the one range or the other, since it is not present by any choice or invitation of its subject, no man of sane judgment can blame its subject for the mere fact of its presence; and surely God's judgment ought not to be imagined to be less regardful of the truth and reason of things than that of men.

Another application of realistic speculation somewhat less distinct than that which we have been considering appears in

* Compare Rom. v, 12, with 2 Cor. v, 14; Eph. ii, 3, with Rom. ii, 14, 15.

connection with the subject of Christ's person and work. Advocates of the mystical theory of the atonement have sometimes represented that Christ's manhood was not simply an individual manhood, but rather generic or universal, and thus capable, as in a real manner embracing the race, to have its doing and suffering rated as the doing and suffering of men generally. Now it is to be admitted that the completeness of Christ's manhood, with its marvelous balance of perfections, and the uniqueness of historical position which belonged to Christ provide for him as man an extraordinary breadth and fullness of relationships. It is also to be admitted that Christ's transcendence of human measures, his possession of a nature spiritual and divine, legitimates the notion of a possible mystical union between himself and those who adhere to him in living faith. But in all this there is nothing to suggest that, in a proper philosophical use of terms, the manhood of Christ is not to be regarded as concrete and individual as is manhood in any other namable instance. The supposition of a veritable universality, as involving the person of Christ in mist and vagueness, tends, so far as it is taken seriously, to embarrass Christian contemplation of the Son of man. It is a supposition, too, which is loaded down with difficulties for rational thinking. No less than the kindred supposition of an all-inclusive Adam, this notion of an all-inclusive Christ assails the proper conception of distinctions of personality. It needs to be inquired, too, in connection with such a notion, whether the universal humanity of Christ embraces all men continually, so as to harbor equally the good and the bad, the saved and the damned; also, whether, in case a portion of the race is dissevered and given an outside standing, this is to be counted prejudicial to the integrity of Christ's manhood. Still, further, it will be pertinent to inquire how, if we are to accept the conclusion that all men were in Christ so as to participate in his dying, we are to construe the fact that so large a portion of the race must have died before they were born. Again, if it is so easy to identify all with one, it may be asked why would not a respectable benevolence insist upon the identification of all with Christ in his earning of eternal and heavenly reward, and so abolish outright all painful con-

tingencies as to the destiny of souls. Once more, a rational desire for insight into the subject may prompt one to ask what the generality of the race were doing in the interval between sinning in Adam and dying in Christ. Surely, if that space is to be regarded as occupied with any serious business, men could fitly be pardoned for being born tired. Beauty and charm belong to the thought of union with Christ by the bonds of faith and love. The notion that there is in Christ a universal manhood, a manhood absorbent or inclusive of men generally, is barren, confusing, fantastic.

Scholastic realism may be credited with a certain service in emphasizing the truth that knowledge rejects the isolation of its objects, and that in the great system of reality there are means for something more than an arbitrary association or grouping of objects. In its characteristic tenet, however, it appropriated from antique philosophy products of immature thinking. The doctrine of the real existence of universals is an unmanageable figment. The coming age will show wisdom in excluding from its theological structure anything which rests upon the realistic postulate as a necessary basis.

H. C. Sheldon.

Art. IV.—FAITH AND BELIEF.

A glance at Cruden's Concordance will show considerable difference in the use of the words "faith" and "belief" in the Bible. The latter word is quoted only once—in 2 Thess. ii, 13—"through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Having in mind the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the faith of the ancients is repeatedly mentioned, we are surprised to find that faith is quoted only twice from the Old Testament—Hab. ii, 4, "But the just shall live by his faith," and Deut. xxxii, 20, "For they are a very froward generation, children in whom is no faith." Aside from the one occurrence of the word "belief," forms of the word—"believe," "believing," and "believer"—occur two hundred and eighty-five times in about two hundred and seventy independent statements, the same statement in several instances having been recorded by different writers. About forty of the occurrences are in the Old Testament, leaving about two hundred and thirty for the New Testament.

The word "faith" occurs two hundred and twenty-six times in the New Testament—twice in half a dozen passages—but the number of independent statements is somewhat less than two hundred. To this number are to be added "faithful" (thirty-nine in the Old Testament; forty in the New Testament), "faithfully" (seven in the Old Testament; one in the New Testament), and "faithfulness" (twenty-one in the Old Testament, nearly all instances being in the Psalms), making three hundred and thirty-six occurrences in the Bible of affirmative forms of the word "faith." This number does not differ greatly from the number of occurrences of the word "belief," though there is considerable difference in the usage of individual writers. St. John's gospel, which has forms of "belief" eighty-six times, does not have "faith" at all. In the epistles, excepting St. John's ("belief" occurring seven times and "faith" once), the word "faith" is largely predominant, especially in the epistles of St. Paul. The frequency of occurrence is also very noticeable in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the

Epistle of James, this being due to the general subject which is presented.

The negative forms of these words are much less commonly used. Thus it is that the expression "faithless" occurs four times, in two independent statements, while the word "unbelief" is found seventeen times, the term "unbelieving" six times, and the word "unbelievers" four times—all of these cases being in the New Testament. These instances, added to the various occurrences of the affirmative forms of the word "belief," make the number nearly the same for forms of the words "faith" and "belief."

Looked at from the standpoint of the Greek nearly all, both affirmative and negative forms, are translations of some form of one Greek word, so that in the mind of the Greek there could not be any opposition or even contrast between "faith" and "belief." In English there is no verb "to faith," and the translators have taken the verb "believe" to represent the Greek verb corresponding to the noun which is translated "faith." For the affirmative noun the Greek has πίστις, which is also, in the Authorized Version, translated "belief," as in 2 Thess. ii, 13, already quoted. Translating here by the word "faith," as πίστις is translated in other passages in the New Testament, the word "belief" would altogether disappear from the Bible.

Both in the New Testament and in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament the verb πιστεύω is used; in the New Testament the present participle of this verb and the verbal adjective πιστός are translated "faithful," "believing," and "believer," the latter term being used to translate the Greek adjective and participle once each. Perhaps the most noticeable expression is Rom. xv, 13, "With all joy and peace in believing," which in Greek contains the infinitive with the article, πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν. Though the Greek adjective is translated in three different ways, in some passages different terms are used in the translation merely for variety of expression, as in John xx, 27: "Be not faithless, but believing," μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός. In this Greek one term is merely the negative of the other, and a parallel translation in the two parts would give, "Be not un-

believing, but believing." The same variation is shown in Rom. iii, 3, "Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?" the Greek being, *μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ καταργήσει.* Another instance, also, is found in Rom. xi, 20, "Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith," *Καλῶς· τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἕστηκας.* In these the affirmative and negative nouns *πίστις* and *ἀπιστία*, "faith" and "unfaith," are contrasted, though in the translation not the latter term, but "unbelief" is used. The Greek form of expression does not in all parts correspond so closely to the English translation. In addition to the Greek forms used in the New Testament, the Hebrew expressions rendered "faithful," "faithfully," and "faithfulness" are also translated by forms of *ἀλήθεια*, "truth," which is used in all passages in the Psalms and Isaiah where "faithfulness" occurs in the English translation.

While nearly all the affirmative Greek terms translated into English by "faith" and "belief" are merely varied forms of one Greek word, this is not so in the case of the negative terms. These are expressed by *πιστεύω* with a negative—the negative formations *ἀπιστέω*, *ἀπιστία*, and *ἄπιστος*—and in addition by *ἀπειθέω* and *ἀπείθεια*, in which the element of persuasion is predominant. "Unbelievers" and "unbelieving," four times each, are the translations of *ἄπιστοι*; and *ἀπειθήσαντες* is also translated "unbelieving" in Acts xiv, 2: "But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles." This verb is also used in Acts xvii, 5; xix, 9; Rom. xi, 30, 31; Heb. iii, 18; xi, 31, where the translation is "believed not," though the negative of "believe" is generally *πιστεύω* with a negative. *Ἀπιστέω* is used in Luke xxiv, 41; Rom. iii, 3; and 2 Tim. ii, 13. "Unbelief" is used to translate *ἀπιστία*, the regular negative of *πίστις*, twelve times, and *ἀπείθεια* is employed five times. The latter term is also rendered by "disobedience" in four passages, and the corresponding verb and verbal are translated in the same way. The Latin translation has a variety of expressions for these terms, but in one passage, Eph. ii, 2, *insuasibilitas*, "unpersuadedness," gives the force of the Greek. Both the verb and noun forms are used in Rom. xi, 30: "For as ye in times past have not believed God, *ἠπειθήσατε*, yet have

now obtained mercy through their unbelief, *ἀπειθείᾳ*." Forms of the word occur also in verses 31 and 32, or four times in three verses. The participial form is used in Heb. xi, 31, "With them that believed not, *τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν*," and in 1 Pet. iii, 20, "To the sometimes disobedient spirits, *ἀπειθήσασίν ποτε*." The force of the terms, as in some other negative expressions, is in the negation of the willingness to believe, and so the denial of an attitude inclining toward belief. Yet this difference between unbelief and unpersuadedness must not be pressed too far, for we read in Heb. iii, 18, 19, "And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." These expressions for unbelief are apparently synonymous; yet the latter is *ἀπιστία*, "unfaith," while the former is *εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειδήσασιν*, "if not to the unpersuaded." In the parallel statement, found in Heb. iv, 6, *ἀπείδεια*, "unpersuadedness," takes the place of *ἀπιστία*, "unfaith."

Though there is no verb form in English corresponding to the noun "faith," use is sometimes made of the equivalent periphrasis "to have faith," *πίστιν ἔχειν*. This expression occurs in three gospels five times, in Acts once, and in the Epistles of St. Paul and of St. James three times each. A comparison of Matt. xxi, 21, with Mark xi, 22, 23, shows that this is a variation of the verbal expression usually translated "believe." The equivalent of the Greek *periphrasis* is found in Latin also, and judging by passages quoted in the lexicons, it occurs most frequently in Roman legal writings, and its appearance in the New Testament may perhaps be an indication of Roman influence over the users of Greek.

R. B. Steele

Art. V.—SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "DIVINE COMEDY."

The great increase of the influence of Dante has been one of the most notable features of the intellectual life of the nineteenth century. At the morning of the twentieth "the voice of ten silent centuries" is sounding through the world as never before. The first English translation of the "Inferno" was published in 1770. Fifteen years later the same translator* published a version of the whole of the *Divine Comedy*. But neither this translation nor one of the "Inferno" which appeared in 1782† gained either the interest of the English public or any great measure of the commendation of critics. The translation by H. F. Cary—of which the "Inferno" appeared in 1805 and the whole poem in 1812—was languidly received at first, but won its way rapidly after it had been eulogized by Coleridge. It passed through several editions in a generation, and is still widely read. Many popular editions of it have been issued. During the last half century English translations of the *Divine Comedy* have been numerous; and now many English and American students are realizing that no other poet suffers so much in even the most faithful translation as Dante, and are mastering Italian in order to fully enjoy the incomparable music and beauty of the greatest of spiritual poems. Among the nineteenth century expositors of Dante, France has two or three great names and Germany many, though it is only a little more than a hundred years since Goethe pronounced the "Inferno" abominable, the "Purgatorio" doubtful, and the "Paradiso" tiresome. Schiller gives no token of any acquaintance with Dante. There has been more progress in the study of Dante in the last seventy-five years than in the previous five hundred, and the interest in the three of his works which have an orderly and vital relation to each other—*La Vita Nuova*, *Il Convito*, and *La Divina Commedia*—is constantly increasing.

The *Vita Nuova* tells the story of his youthful love for Beatrice—his pure passion for one who seemed to him a mira-

* The Rev. Henry Boyd. † By Charles Rogers.

cle from heaven, whose beauty moved none to envy but all to gentleness and faith and love. The *Convito* relates how afterward human philosophy won his devotion and intellectual pride blinded him to the beauty of spiritual faith. The *Divine Comedy* begins with his conversion. Beatrice has now become to him the embodiment of divine grace and truth. Through her comes the gracious summons by which he is led to spiritual freedom and rest in God. No other great poem has so personal an interest, no other is so autobiographic; but Dante's journey through hell, his toil upward from cornice to cornice of the mount of cleansing, and his ascent from glory to glory in the "Paradiso" were not for himself alone. He represented the race. In form the *Divine Comedy* is a literal vision of the world beyond the grave. Nothing can be more realistic than the poet's description of every incident of his difficult, perilous, and awful journey through hell, his climb up the purgatorial mountain, and his flight from heaven to heaven under the guidance of Beatrice; his interviews with all varieties of sinners and of saints; his first sight of the city of Dis, with its domes made red by the eternal fire; his morning vision of the trembling sea from the steep mountain of Purgatory; his countless etchings of picturesque details; his portraits of fiends, angels, and men and women, lost or glorified. He makes us see the boiling pitch of Malebolge, the bubbles that arise in the slime of the Styx from the sobs of the sullen who lie immersed in the black mire, the ruined souls fleeing like frogs before the face of the heavenly messenger, the traitors glimmering through the ice of Cocytus like straws in glass.

But, while the vision is so literal in form, it has an allegorical meaning. Dante, the pilgrim, represents man, whose salvation is a threefold process: (1) The realization of the guilt and doom of sin; (2) The attainment of spiritual purity and freedom; (3) Union with God. In his dedicatory letter to Can Grande della Scala, Dante says:

> The aim of the whole and of the individual parts is to bring those who are living in this life out of a state of misery, and to guide them to a state of happiness. . . . The subject of the whole work, then, taken literally, is the state of souls after death regarded as matter of fact; for the action of the whole work deals with this, and is about this. But, if

the work be taken allegorically, its subject is man, in so far as by merit or demerit in the exercise of free will he is exposed to the rewards or punishment of justice.

Henry Hart Milman calls Dante "the one authorized topographer of the mediæval hell." The "Inferno" of Dante is nevertheless his own creation; perhaps it would be better to say, his own vision of the guilt and punishment of sin. Its significance is not in its resemblance to mediæval notions of hell, but in the features that are original with him. Current mediæval conceptions of hell were as unreasonable as they were grotesque and horrible. Dante's hell also has abundance of grotesqueness and horror, but is never irrational. Sin and punishment closely correspond. Grotesqueness, horror, and cruelty are essential traits of sin.

Dante's supreme contempt was for those who had not sufficient courage and will power to qualify themselves even for hell, "those who lived without infamy or praise," the caitiff wretches hateful to God and to his enemies, who never were alive, who endlessly follow a whirling banner and are perpetually stung by gadflies and hornets:

> These have no longer any hope of death;
> And this blind life of theirs is so debased,
> They envious are of every other fate.
> No fame of them the world permits to be;
> Misericord and justice both disdain them.
> Let us not speak of them, but look, and pass.*

Thus he emphasizes his respect for the sovereignty of the human will. In the descending circles of the "Inferno" are those who have been masters of their own fate. The infinite justice built hell, not supreme caprice. Its foundations and those of heaven are both laid in the will of man, who determines his own destiny, being the free architect of his own character. In the "Inferno" are those who "have foregone the good of intellect." They have made their own choice:

> Celestial justice spurs them on,
> So that their fear is turned into desire.
> This way there never passes a good soul.

The order of degrees of guilt in the "Inferno" is significant. The incontinent are in the upper circle; the violent are

* *Inf.*, III, 46–51. The metrical quotations are from Longfellow's translation.

far down; below the violent are the fraudulent, seducers, flatterers, fortune tellers, those who make merchandise of justice, hypocrites, thieves, falsifiers; lowest of all are traitors. This order is determined by the relative effect of the various sins upon society. The man of appetites mainly wrongs himself; the violent imperil society; the fraudulent destroy the bond of social confidence; universal treachery would annihilate society—the traitor can have no mutual fellowship, he isolates himself in ice. The intemperate or gluttonous man may make himself little better than a beast; but the traitor dehumanizes himself and becomes a fiend. He can have no home, no friend, no country, no God. Even treachery, the worst of sins, has its different degrees, ranging downward from those who betray their kindred, country, or friends to Lucifer, "the emperor of the kingdom dolorous."

Many on superficial acquaintance with the "Inferno" have been repelled by its horrors, its seemingly cruel torments. But in reality Dante represents sin as its own punishment. His material representations — doleful, grotesque, horrible, terrible—are all the fruit of the respective sins. Each works its own punishment. Its doom is in its nature. The essence of sin is selfishness, which is destructive of real selfhood. The weary, naked, ruined souls blaspheme God, the human race, their progenitors, and their own birth. Lustful passion is a hurricane that never rests, driving the soul in darkness "hither, thither, downward, upward." Intemperance and gluttony make men beastly and drench them in filth. The avaricious and the prodigal both have an ignoble and fruitless slavery to material things, and their hell is simply the perpetuation of their ill-giving and ill-taking. Anger fills the soul with sluggish smoke and mire.* Political corruption is like boiling pitch. Hypocrites are a painted people, whose cloak, outwardly gilded, is heavy, "a weary mantle" in time and eternity. The thief in taking the property of others loses his own personality and is transformed into a snake. Evil counselors are tongues of flame, self-consumed with the

* In the third chapter of *Kim*, Rudyard Kipling's story now in course of publication in *McClure's Magazine*, the lama says, "He was led to speak harshly by the red mist of anger."

mischief whereby they injure others. Liars get to believe their own falsehoods; their sin is like a burning and delirious fever. Treachery makes the heart as cold and lifeless as ice. All of the grotesqueness and shame and horror of Dante's "Inferno" are visible about us. All of its torments are being suffered in the life that now is. Every sinner has a hell in his own heart. The doom of the miser is in his frenzy for mere accumulation. Beastliness is found in palaces, as well as in slums. Every edition of a daily paper tells us of the serpents of fraud, the pitch of corruption, the weariness of those who lead a double life. The living traitor is as isolated as though he were frozen into the eternal ice of the farthest north or Dante's Cocytus. In picturing the punishments of hell Dante has only told us of the actual and inevitable reaction of sin on its subject. The "Paradiso" may be an unknown country to all but a few; but the world of wickedness is the "Inferno." It is all around us. Even those who are not of it live in it. We need the guidance of the reason and the protection of angels, if we would safely traverse its marshes and mire and pitfalls, its realms of fire and filth and blood.

In the "Purgatorio" we have Dante's conception of personal salvation. This is nothing less than the winning of holy self-control. Salvation is character. Character is an achievement. The infinite grace has provided a mount of purification. He that would be clean and free must climb, and he cannot begin his arduous endeavor till he has girded himself with the rush of humility. The prayers of others will aid him by increasing his consciousness and receptiveness of divine sympathy and help, but they do not take a single step from the upward journey. In patience and persistence the upward toiling pilgrim must win his soul. The agony of his endeavor is immeasurable; but it is not intolerable, for the atmosphere is full of light and hope and vocal with music. A new life is in his heart, for the resurrection has become to him an inward reality. It is the dawn of Easter when he comes to the foot of the purifying mountain. When he enters on that "realm where the spirit is purified and becomes worthy to ascend to heaven," a soft color of oriental sapphire, gathered in the serene aspect of the pure air, renews delight to his

eyes. The air of sin is dead; but to the penitent the heavens appear to rejoice in their flamelets. Even the wormwood of his torments is sweet. All the ministries of art, nature, and human society promote his progress.

The beginning of spiritual development is confession, contrition, and the sacrifice of self. The first step to the portal of the mount of purification is a mirror in which the sinner sees his real condition; the second is rough and scorched, cracked lengthwise and across; the third is porphyry, flaming red as blood.. The angel who sits on the diamond threshold is clad with raiment of the color of ashes, and to the pleading penitent he opens the door with the golden key of authority and the silver key of knowledge. The toil and pain of the successive circles of the mount are not penal, nor are they merely penances; they are a moral gymnastic, a spiritual discipline. The pilgrim comes to realize the nature of the deadly sins, and when his discipline in each circle has done its perfect work he rises by free volition to "a better seat,"

> And aye the more one climbs, the less it hurts.

He practices humility till it becomes a habit; is conscious of the blindness of envy till he learns to rejoice in the welfare of others; endures the stifling smoke of anger till his heart is filled with peace and mercy; contends against sloth till his spirit is aflame with zeal and energy; is taught the groveling nature of avarice till he is completely purged from it; is cured of gluttony and intemperance by abstinence while in sight of the most tempting fruits, meanwhile praying for spiritual longings; and plunges eagerly into the fire that purifies from lustful passions, a fire so fierce that Dante says of it, "I would have flung myself into boiling glass to cool me, so immeasurable was the degree of heat." As he rises from terrace to terrace of moral purification celestial voices celebrate his victory by singing a beatitude. Thus, by practice of virtue he becomes morally free and king over himself:

> Free and upright and sound is thy free will,
> And error were it not to do its bidding;
> Thee o'er thyself I therefore crown and miter.

Thus he is prepared, not only to die, but to live. He is ready

to enter the terrestrial paradise, a life of active holiness. Dante's description of this terrestrial paradise is of marvelous beauty. The living forest, the soil everywhere breathing fragrance, the sweet breeze, the birds singing in the trembling branches, the stream so pure that it hid nothing though moving along dusky under the perpetual shadow, the "solitary lady who was going along, singing, and culling flower from flower, wherewith all her path was painted," form a peerless picture. Here the memory ceases to remember evil, here it becomes quick to recall every good deed. The real continuity of life is not in its worst, but in its best. Here is allegory within allegory, the pageant of the Church's triumph, the vision of divine grace in the person of Beatrice, "the splendor of the living light eternal." Here the pilgrim, revived by the sweet draught of Eunoë, becomes

> Pure and disposed to mount unto the stars.

Made free, realizing his union with the social whole, instructed and trained in both contemplative and active spiritual virtue, the pilgrim proceeds "from glory to glory." Dante's "Paradiso," though divided into ten heavens, is not a place but a state. The "Purgatorio" sets forth the achievement of character, the training of man for right relationship with his kind; the "Paradiso" represents the relationship of the saved soul to God. The direct vision of God is not a matter of location in space. It is the privilege of the pure in heart. Holiness is of different degrees, but all holiness is heavenly:

> The seraphim most absorbed in God,
> Moses and Samuel, and whichever John
> Thou mayst select, I say, and even Mary
> Have not in any other heaven their seats
> Than have those spirits that just appeared to thee,
> Nor of existence more or fewer years;
> But all make beautiful the primal circle,
> And have sweet life in different degrees,
> By feeling more or less the eternal breath.*

The "perfect life of love and peacefulness" has no limitations of space. It is the same on earth or beyond the sun. In the "Convito" Dante tells us:

* *Par.*, IV, 28-36.

> The empyrean heaven by its peace signifies the divine science of theology, which is full of peace and unperturbed by strife of opinion or of sophistical arguments, by reason of the preeminent certitude of its subject, God himself. . . . The human soul, ennobled by the highest power, that is by reason, partakes of the divine nature in the manner of an eternal Intelligence; because the soul is so ennobled by the sovereign power, and denuded of matter, that the divine light shines in it as an angel; and therefore man has been called by the philosophers a divine animal.

Dante's scheme of ten heavens enables him to continue the realism of his allegory while exhibiting different degrees of holiness. In the unity of the perfect society there is endless individual diversity. The lowest degree of the heavenly life is that of those whose conformity to the divine will is formal and variable. In the second heaven are those whose love of God is alloyed with love of fame. The third heaven is that of those who have found their joy in human affection, whose life has been absorbed in the love of kindred, or friend, or lover. In the fourth are the lovers of divine truth, theologians, whose light and ardor proceed from the vision of God, a vision ever growing clearer and brighter, spirits seraphic and splendid with "light cherubical." Still more glorious is the fifth heaven, the home of heroes and martyrs, whose self-sacrifice has been unto death; they form a living cross, and they sing "Arise and conquer." The sixth heaven is that of just rulers, those whose greatness has been mercy and service. Each appears a burning ruby; all are united to form

> The beautiful image that in sweet fruition
> Made jubilant the interwoven souls.

No good deed is solitary. The complete self-realization is that which comes by union with our fellow-men. Righteous rulers are all vitally related. The seventh heaven is that of the mystics. In the eighth Dante beholds the triumph of Christ. In the *primum mobile*, the crystalline heaven, are the concentric circles of the angelic hierarchy, all gazing upward to God, and all attracting others to him. Then the pilgrim comes to the Empyrean, where is the river of light flowing between banks of eternal spring. From the river issue living sparks, that on all sides sink down into the flowers, "like unto rubies that are set in gold:"

In fashion then as of a snow-white rose
Displayed itself to me the saintly host,
Whom Christ in his own blood had made his bride;
But the other host, that flying sees and sings
The glory of Him who doth enamor it,
And the goodness that created it so noble,
Even as a swarm of bees that sinks in flowers
One moment, and the next returns again
To where its labor is to sweetness turned,
Sank into the great flower, that is adorned
With leaves so many, and thence reascended
To where its love abideth evermore.
Their faces had they all of living flame,
And wings of gold, and all the rest so white
No snow unto that limit doth attain.*

The vision of the mystic rose, whose petals are the ranks of the glorified saints and heroes, is succeeded by the unveiling of the mystery of the holy Trinity, the pilgrim's mind being illumined by "a flash of lightning wherein came its wish." His desire and will are now completely possessed by

The love which moves the sun and the other stars.

Man has reached his goal. His pilgrimage is ended. The vision of God inspires the life of perfect love. The lowest heaven is that of love limited and imperfect; the supreme heaven is that of love universal and perfect. Personality is completed and glorified by divine union. The Empyrean is

The heaven that is pure light,
Light intellectual, replete with love,
Love of true good replete with ecstasy,
Ecstasy that transcendeth every sweetness.

Thus from love formal and inconstant there is progress through the successive heavens till perfect vision of God creates perfect oneness with the divine will. In the "Paradiso" there is no sensuous delight. Its progress is constant increase of light, increase of knowledge, and increase of love. The nearer Dante comes to the Empyrean, the more rapid is his movement, which at the beginning is like the flight of an arrow. The increasing glory is suggested by the increasing splendor in the face of Beatrice,

* *Par.*, XXI, 1-15.

That along the stairs
Of the eternal palace more enkindles,
. . . the farther we ascend.

In hell there was no light, no music, all movement was difficult. In the "Purgatorio" there is light and music; but motion is impeded, progress is an achievement of the determined will that fights for cleansing and freedom, looking not back, inspired by the hope that moral freedom shall at last be attained, though ages be spent in the agony of the endeavor. In the "Paradiso" motion forward and upward has become the very law of the being; the soul ascends as naturally as a rivulet descends from a mountain to the lowland:

There is a light above, which visible
Makes the Creator unto every creature
Who only in beholding him has peace.

The *Divine Comedy* contains the photograph of the mediæval world. Dante believed himself divinely commissioned to show his own age its sin and to reveal to it the way of reform and salvation. But that is a very shallow view of Dante which finds in him only the theology of the mediæval Church, or the dualism of the empire and the papacy. The teaching of his wonderful poem is a living Gospel still. Its cardinal truths he did not receive, either from Romanism or from the scholastic philosophy with which he was so familiar. He was even more familiar with the Bible than with Aristotle, Boethius and Aquinas, St. Francis of Assisi, Bonaventura, and Joachim di Fiori. His reason was as transcendent as his imagination, and his spiritual vision was that of a seer and a saint. The spirit of the *Divine Comedy* is essentially modern. Only within the last half century has the Christian pulpit come up to Dante's view that the punishment of the sinner is the reaction of his own sin upon him. The distinction between a religious nature and a religious character, which he makes so clear, is still practically unknown to the majority of Christendom. The race is still progressing toward his conception of the greatness of man. The truth as well as the music of the following peerless line will never be outgrown:

In la sua volontate è nostra pace.

In this age we still need Dante's conception of the sov-

ereignity of the human will, his vision of the infinite value of the soul. His great poem pictures the whole world, time, and eternity, but he finds it all in the individual man. Personal freedom, progress, and purity are the essentials to a perfect society. Neither heredity nor environment determines character and destiny, unless God be regarded as the supreme element in both the former. Every soul must somehow come to its free choice, its supreme opportunity.

With the inexorable justice of the poem there is mingled marvelous beauty of human nature, even in the sinful. Dante's hell is no indiscriminating lake of fire and brimstone. The lost are human still. They have traits of appealing loveliness or colossal greatness. What womanly charm in Francesca, notwithstanding the greatness of her sin! What noble dignity in Farinata, standing erect in his burning tomb! What paternal love in old Cavalcanti! What scornful kingliness in Capaneus! With what matchless pathos Ugolino renews his desperate grief! Dante in a line can make us see the whole drama of a human life. No other poem so exalts human nature. There was in this lofty spirit a profound sympathy with the sorrows, aspirations, and emotions of the multitude. In a remarkable passage on Dante in his *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy* Frederick Denison Maurice says:

> The transcendental metaphysician never for an instant forgets the sorrows of the actual world in which he is living; the student sustains the patriot. Drenched in the school lore, it is still the vulgar eloquence, the speech of the people, that is dear to him. Virgil is his master because Virgil was a Mantuan and sang of Italy. And neither theology, politics, nor the study of ancient song crushes the life of the individual man. Fervent human love was the commencement to the poet of a new life. Through the little child of nine years old he rises to the contemplation of the divine charity which governs all things in heaven and subdues earth to itself.

While no other poem so depicts the unnaturalness, the wretchedness, the inevitable doom of sin, no other is so hopeful. There is no hope for those who voluntarily continue sinful; there is infinite hope for those who will repent. "While hope hath speck of green" the eternal love is within reach. Browning, a kindred spirit, calls Dante a "plucker of amaranths grown

beneath God's eye." This is surely a juster characterization than that of Macaulay, who says of the *Divine Comedy:*

> There is perhaps no work in the world so deeply and uniformly sorrowful. The melancholy of Dante was no fantastic caprice. . . . It was from within. Neither love nor glory, neither the conflict of earth nor the hope of heaven could dispel it. . . . The gloom of his character discolors all the passions of man and all the face of nature, and tinges with its own livid hue the flowers of Paradise and the glories of the eternal throne.

Macaulay could not have been really familiar with the "Purgatorio" and the "Paradiso." He seems, moreover, to have interpreted the character of Dante from his portraits, of which he had then seen only the sterner ones.* In the "Purgatorio" hope is triumphant, and the "Paradiso" is all life, light, and music. The *Divine Comedy* shows how the perfection open to the individual is prophetic of a universal human society. The virtue of one is the pledge of the unity and happiness of all. Man becomes thoroughly human by becoming filled with God. Dante called his "mystic, unfathomable song" a "Comedy," because it ends well. Its final scene is the transformation of human nature by the vision of God. Sun, moon, and stars are under the feet of the penitent, who beholds the glory of God and is filled with his love.

The *Divine Comedy* is as contemporaneous as Browning or Rudyard Kipling; for its keynote, like theirs, is the infinite value of the human nature that is in every man. Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise are actual in the life of to-day. Sin is degradation and suffering in any world; but man can do God's will freely, joyously, eternally. He that wrestles and climbs may attain. The "fruition of the divine countenance" is not conditioned upon disembodiment, but upon faith.

*Macaulay's "Essay on Milton," which contains his characterization of Dante, was published in 1825. The beautiful Bargello portrait of Dante, by Giotto, was not discovered till 1841.

J. E. C. Sawyer.

Art. VI.—ARISTOTELIANISM IN MODERN THOUGHT; A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

In the history of philosophy antiquity reveals two figures distinct and dominant, Plato and Aristotle. The one was imaginative and idealistic; the other, practical and material. The one, metaphysical and mystical; the other, realistic and logical. "Plato stands with upturned finger, pointing to the one perfect Good beyond the clouds; Aristotle, with downturned hand outstretched toward the complex details of earth."* In all the development of thought no two men have had such directing power. The Academy and the Lyceum marked the channels for the movement of minds for hundreds of years, and even in this day a careful student can easily discover a seepage from the old channels into some which have been pronounced absolutely new and original. The believer in originality is startled by the philosophic foreshadowings of antiquity. In the primitive system of Anaximander, for instance, can be seen the rudiments of the evolutionary theory. Many of the terms of modern materialism are found in the system of Anaximenes. The leading tenets of Pythagoras are closely allied to modern theosophical speculation. The heliocentric doctrine is embryonic in Pythagoreanism. The pessimism of Schopenhauer is foreshadowed by the "typical pessimist of antiquity," Heraclitus. An incipient Darwinism can be read in Empedocles. Anaxagoras, in some matters, anticipates Buffon and La Place.

In the philosophic syncretism which reigned in Rome at the beginning of our era it is interesting to notice the apparent inability of thought to get away from the methods of Plato and Aristotle. Neoplatonism and the degenerate philosophy of this time proves the truth of the statement. Christian thought could not altogether escape from the influences which radiated from Athens. "The breath of expiring Hellenism passed into Christianity. The doctrines of Plato and his latest interpreters continue to influence the ablest thinkers among the followers of the Gospel, and the

* Hyde, *God's Education of Man*, p. 215.

philosophy of the Church during the entire Middle Ages merely reechoes the teaching of the great Athenian philosophers."* Even to-day there are some systems in which the influence of Plato's "idea as a reality" can be traced. The horror of matter, the utter godlessness of the material, held through the ages, is born out of Platonic doctrine.

To the student of history it is scarcely necessary to speak of the adjustments and the modifications of thought which took place at Alexandria between the Greek and the Semite. Extreme schemes of thought, even, are not in perpetual conflict. There is going on continually an effort to discover points of similarity. It were impossible that the systems current in the empire exist and not modify each other in some degree. An illustration is furnished by Tertullian, a great heresy hunter, but who ended by becoming, himself, a heretic. Justin Martyr, the author of the *Apologies*, did draw from Plato in his discussion of the Logos doctrine; and who shall say that the beloved apostle was not influenced by the prevailing philosophic thought during his contact with the Greek mind, particularly at Ephesus? Tatian, St. Clement, and Origen, were all moved by Greek conceptions of things. St. Augustine could not get away from them. His theodicy is essentially Platonic. In fact, Augustine seems to be permeated by the subtle power of Plato. Had Plato not lived, the ontological argument of Anselm would never have been put in logical terms. In the famous discussions between the realists and the nominalists the "idea as a reality" is prominently set forth by one party. To accept the opposite view at this juncture would have been to change the whole current of speculation. It would have modified theology, and history would have been very far different. Plato's "idea" favored the established order of things, because the stream had thus far been influenced by this force. "The Church must be realistic, and declare with the Academy, *Universalia sunt realia.* Catholicism is synonymous with realism." The metaphysics of the early Church are built on Platonic foundations.

While Plato controlled the thinking of men on the lines of the ideal, Aristotle quickened the thought of men in the

*Weber, *History of Philosophy*, p. 185.

practical and the positivistic. It is especially with the latter that we have to do. In the philosophy of nature is the genius of the Stagirite revealed. His doctrines of space and movement are not, to any great extent, suggestive, but in his teleology of nature he is especially rich. His differentiation of thought and instinct is careful and fruitful. His doctrine of "ends" in nature reminds one of our own Fiske. When the reaction came in philosophy; when, toward the latter end of the Middle Ages, its *a priori* element was bitterly arraigned; when men began to interrogate nature herself, Aristotle rather than Plato naturally received the first place.

When Aristotle was introduced into Europe, *via* Alexandria and Arabia; when the trend of thinking was toward him, it was quite natural that the Church accept him with open arms as her "official philosopher." The balance of power she was determined to maintain. Was not the Church in danger from the discriminations of the profound? If Catholicism could quiet the fears of these thinkers, it would be well; and to do so she did not hesitate to receive Aristotle in great fullness. Platonism was relegated to the rear, and Peripateticism was enthroned. Thus Aristotle and his system obtained a grip on the later thinking of the world; thus he came to control the thought channels in which philosophy long moved.

Aristotle said that the "sphere of becoming was the stage of nature proper, as distinguished from the sky, which is the abode of the supernatural, that is, of the unchangeable and everlasting." His "dualistic conception of an earth placed in the center of the world and a God placed at the periphery, as far from the earth as possible," says one authority, "caused the Church to adopt the Aristotelian system, and led to its being forced upon the minds of men as revealed truth, even after the great majority of scientists had taken sides with Copernicus." * Our modern philosophical vocabulary comes, in part, from Thomas of Aquino, who was largely influenced by Aristotle; and it is thus not difficult to see how the Church came to have a vitiated view of the Copernican system.

The Ptolemaic astronomy was regnant for nearly fifteen hundred years. The cosmography of this famous thinker threat-

* Weber, *History of Philosophy*, p. 124.

ened the philosophy of the Church. It endangered the whole institution. The Church had accepted Aristotle. If she should be proven in the wrong, would it not make her a very material and fallible institution? Would it not militate against the Bible? The theory of Ptolemy was supported by great names in the past. It had received the sanction of the authorities of the Church, therefore it must be true. Aristotle was right. The earth was the center of things:

> If the sun is the center of the planetary orbits, if the earth moves, then, so they held, Joshua did not perform his miracle, then the Bible is in error, and the Church fallible. If the earth is a planet, then it moves in heaven, and is no longer the antithesis of heaven; then heaven and earth are no longer opposed, as tradition assumed, but form one indivisible universe.*

The Church suppressed Galileo, but she struggled against fate:

> On the ruins of its ivy-grown cathedrals ecclesiasticism, surprised and blinded by the breaking day, sat solemnly blinking at the life and light about it, absorbed in the recollection of the night that had passed, dreaming of new phantoms and delusion in its wished-for return, and vindictively striking its talons at any derisive assailant who incautiously approached too near. †

While the author of the above is somewhat prejudiced, the attitude of the Church toward Aristotle and the traditions of the past is not pleasant to dwell upon. Her support, her strength was given to the theory of "the here and the beyond." Her hesitancy to accept truth caused incalculable mischief. It bred the conflict with science and religion. It colored theological thinking for scores of years. The apologetics of Christianity were sent out on misleading lines. It bred a transcendentalism not helpful to thinkers; and it, in its turn, developed a practical infidelity. It threw philosophy into a vain and profitless discussion, and originated volumes which, in the light of a better day, are among the "curiosities of literature." The results are not yet absent from the world. Men talk about "the here and the beyond," forgetting that they are not indebted to the Christ system so much as to Aristotle and the Church of the Middle Ages.

* Weber, *History of Philosophy*, p. 284.

† Draper, *Intellectual Development of Europe*, vol. ii, p. 284.

The doctrine which is gaining ground to-day does not partake of Aristotelianism. It is in opposition to that proclaimed by the dominant power of the Middle Ages. It is rationally deducible from the Bible—the doctrine of the immanency of the Divine. The discursions on law, which are characteristic of this age, are the expression of this idea. The philosophical readjustments, the modification of types of theology, the unrest, the strife tell the story of a movement away from the dogmatism of Aristotle. A recent writer suggestively says:

> The Copernican astronomy made men dizzy for a time, and they held on to the Ptolemaic system to escape vertigo. In like manner the conception of God, as revealing himself in a great historical movement and process, in the consciences and lives of holy men, in the unfolding life of the Church makes dizzy the believer in a dictated book, and he longs for some fixed word which shall be sure and steadfast.*

The swing of thought from transcendence to immanence is to make noticeable, in the history of philosophy, this present period. The whole realm of thought will be affected by it. Some effete systems may have to look to their foundations; some philosophies and theologies will need reconstruction; but the end will mean the broadening of life, superior views of the universe, and finer conceptions of duty. It will mean the banishment of mere authority and the insistence of basic truth as the first requisite of metaphysical, ethical, and religious superstructure. It will mean no name dominant except by the force on truth, and thus it will bring about the annihilation of the metaphysical errors of Aristotle and the liberation of the mind from the slavery of mere authority.

* Professor B. P. Bowne, *Independent*, April 19, 1900.

Benjamin Young.

Art. VII.—KESWICK AND ITS TEACHING.

This little English town of some three thousand inhabitants nestling at the foot of Skiddaw, on the lovely shores of Derwentwater—in the very center of that lake country whose beauty fired the souls of Southey, Coleridge, and Wordsworth, and attracts thousands of tourists—has come in late years to stand for a movement in spiritual things deserving of the most critical examination. Prolonged gatherings for devotional, as distinguished from theological or ecclesiastical, purposes are one of the most encouraging characteristics of the present day. They are not confined to Christians of any one school of thought, but under various names—"Retreats," "Quiet Days," "Conventions," "Conferences," "Camp Meetings"—have been widely utilized to quicken spiritual life; and they seem to be imperatively demanded because of the unsatisfactory experience of the average Christian, who is largely destitute of real power and hampered by many weights—not to say sins—in the running of the heavenly race. When such a believer becomes conscious of his poverty, he feels the needs of warm sympathy and competent instruction, neither of which, perhaps, he finds at hand; and hence the call for a place where those like-minded may assemble and mutually minister to each other's faith.

Of all such places Keswick is unsurpassed in the way of natural scenery, which, though a minor matter, has nevertheless an appreciable influence in lifting the soul to the glories of the unseen world. The towering mountain, the glassy lake, the winding stream, the falling cascade, the wooded glen, with luxuriant pasture lands and fruitful gardens, lend an inspiration to one who is in communion with their Maker, and furnish a fit setting for fervent prayer and holy speech. No other place has for so long a time attracted such multitudes; the assembly during the last week of the coming July will be the twenty-seventh consecutive meeting in this favored spot. The people in attendance at Keswick are of the best—those whose associations and intelligence demand and appreciate a clear, forceful, intellectual presentation of the truth, those least

likely to be ephemeral in their purpose or narrowly restricted in their opinions. A measure of strength resides also in their numbers. From eight to ten thousand are usually there during the week. Yet there is no confusion. Quietness combined with prayerfulness distinguishes the throng. It is, perhaps, the calmest assembly ever convened for spiritual advancement. There are no attempts to work upon the feelings, but happiness beams in every eye and abiding peace pervades all faces. There is marked courtesy and thoughtfulness for others, the chastened chivalry of Christian gentlefolk. The attire of all present is simple, although nearly all are evidently well-to-do. Deep seriousness prevails, and an expectation of blessing. There is no criticism. An attitude of stillness before God is carefully cultivated, as of those waiting in the presence chamber of the Most High. The conversation on all sides is about the things of the kingdom. Groups for prayer are frequent, as are also open-air services. Most of those one meets carry a Bible and hymn book. The town is wholly given over to religion. Everything is subordinated to this one end; the indefinable charm of the invisible presence is profoundly felt, and days of heaven upon earth are enjoyed.

The people come, with one desire, from all quarters of the earth. Every country in Europe is represented, as well as America, Africa, India, China, and Palestine. Scotland and Ireland send large contingents. Great numbers of missionaries are there, for whose entertainment special provision is made and special funds collected. Companies of students from the various universities and theological institutions of Great Britain lodge together. Ministers, of course, abound. A large proportion of those present are young men and women with notebook and pencil, alert and purposeful. There are separate ladies' meetings, which are among the best held. A great missionary meeting closes the series, and missionary enthusiasm throughout the week rises to a very high level, as might be expected; for any so-called movement in the direction of sanctification is radically deficient which does not raise up missionaries at home and abroad. Keswick, indeed, supports a number of missionaries in various foreign fields, connected with different organizations, and sends out deputations to various lands to propagate the

principles which it has found so great a source of blessing. Probably as many as two hundred minor conventions also meet under its auspices. For several years meetings have been annually held at Blankenburg in Germany, where people from all parts of that empire, as also from Russia, Austria, Switzerland, Holland, and other countries, come together. There were nearly a thousand present last year. There is a similar convention at Sodertelge in Sweden, near Stockholm, on the shores of the Baltic, presided over by Prince Bernadotte, where many assemble from Finland, Norway, and Denmark. A meeting of the same sort has been held with marvelous effect in Central Africa, by the missionaries to Uganda. The movement, in short, has already assumed immense proportions and bids fair to spread yet more widely.

There is, however, but one Keswick. Nothing on either side of the water furnishes any proper parallel to this stupendous gathering. It has been greatly favored in the leaders and teachers that have been providentially raised up, many of them having now for a score or more of years given unity and coherency to the enterprise.* These men vary, of course, in their manner of presenting the truth, though there is a substantial oneness in their views and experience. There are some forty different men and women whose voices are heard at these conventions. One speaks as a theologian, another as a Bible expositor, another excels in Bible readings. One can define and discriminate, another has a particular tenderness and unction, to another is given keen insight into obscure truths, still another can illustrate and bring home to the heart what is well known. There is never any set programme of topics, never any announcement of speakers or subjects. Yet no two addresses cover the same ground or ever conflict. On the con-

*The Rev. E. H. Hopkins, editor of *The Life of Faith* and author of many volumes, has been near the helm from the start. Identified with it from the beginning, and still presiding part of the time, though in much feebleness of body, is Mr. Robert Wilson, a layman of the Church of England. Other prominent speakers and leaders are the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, now of Northfield, Mass.; the Rev. Charles Inwood, of Belfast, who has visited many lands under deputation from Keswick; Professor Handley Moule; Dr. John Smith, of Edinburgh; Dr. J. Elder Cumming, the Revs. Hubert Brooke, C. S. Moore, J. J. Luce, and C. A. Fox. On the Keswick platform have also appeared with great acceptance, from other countries, Pastor Th. Monod, of France; J. Hudson Taylor, of China; Andrew Murray, of South Africa; F. B. Macartney, of Australia; and A. T. Pierson, of America.

trary, it has been often remarked that a special evidence of the presidency of the Holy Spirit seems to be found in the fact that without prearrangement there is a very remarkable pertinency in the order of themes.

The unity of the Church of Christ is greatly emphasized at these gatherings; and this must be set down as one of the main secrets of the success reached. Over the entrance of the huge tent or pavilion, seating over three thousand persons, in which the main meetings are held, waves the motto, "All one in Christ Jesus." Class and creed and clime are quite unknown; no special deference is paid to men because of high social or ecclesiastical position; no dependence is based upon human patronage; no effort is made to secure public attention or to attract large numbers; no speaker is asked to take part because of reputed learning or eloquence. Clear witnesses are rather sought to the power of God to save to the uttermost, this testimony being indispensable; yet those are of course preferred who have given evidence that they also know how to put truth clearly. Nothing erratic or of doubtful tendency is admitted. A jarring note is scarcely ever heard. There are no questionable methods, there is no mischievous and divisive teaching, there is a total absence of censoriousness and sentimentalism. Each speaker seems to feel that he is dealing with a message from God, under special guidance from on high. There is no attempt to unravel the tangles of prophecy, or to explain what is beyond our present capacity of understanding; the whole effort is to help toward a closer following of Christ and a better comprehension of the Scriptures. Out of thirty speakers in 1896, fifteen gave direct expositions of the word of God. Out of seventy-four addresses in 1899, thirty-seven were by Church of England bishops and clergy, thirty-seven by Nonconformist ministers and laymen from many churches, and all were in perfect harmony. The fellowship of Christians in this place seems to be complete. No denominational names are mentioned, no theological strifes are known. There is a delightful sacramental service at one stage of the meeting. Three banners on the top of the tent proclaimed far and near the watchwords, "Love, Joy, Peace." The singing is

purely devotional, wholly congregational, perfectly simple, and intensely impressive. The Spirit of God is honored and the word of God exalted as perhaps nowhere else. The Lord Jesus is given first place in address and song and conversation. "Jesus only" might be said to be the prevailing theme, and yet it might also be affirmed that no one truth is more emphasized than the personality of the Holy Ghost, since the two things entirely harmonize. Seasons of silent prayer are frequent, and are often the means of special blessing. There is also much intercessory prayer. "Some friends were to be found at almost all hours of the day," writes a visitor, "in the little Wesleyan chapel in Southey Street, denying themselves the pleasure of the great meetings so as to uphold the speakers in prayer and to lay definitely before God the needs of each particular meeting." The after-meetings are conducted with rare skill; people are led to decide, yet are not overpressed. No undue stress is laid upon any visible act of surrender, there is no formal pattern of procedure uniformly followed, but there is a wholesome insistence upon a present, open decision, a full committal to the new life. For it is clearly recognized that no mere proximity to the fountain will quench thirst; there must be a moment of acceptance, an act of entering in. And the constant effort is made to bring the attendants to the immediate appropriation of Christ in all his power to sanctify, as well as to save, to endue as well as to redeem.

The question will, of course, occur to the reader—and it is an important one—as to how this gathering began, so owned of God for more than a quarter of a century. Mr. R. Pearsall Smith, of Philadelphia—thirty years ago an evangelist of rare power, and author of those wonderful little books, *Holiness through Faith* and *Walking in the Light*, to which his wife's most excellent *Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* is a worthy successor—seems to have dropped the seeds so remarkably germinant. In 1873 he wrote—we believe here in America—certain articles which were republished in the London *Christian*, presenting so forcibly and reasonably, without technical terms or sectarian shibboleths, the power of Christ to save to

the uttermost that they produced an immediate and powerful impression in England. Meetings prompted by them, devoted to the realization of greater practical holiness, were held in the Young Men's Christian Association Rooms, London, the Mildmay Conference Hall, and other places. During the next year Mr. Samuel Morley, member of Parliament for Bristol, a wealthy Congregationalist, held a series of breakfasts at which some twenty-four hundred ministers in parties of thirty or forty prayerfully and earnestly considered this same high theme, with great blessing to many. Two or three conventions followed, in all of which Mr. and Mrs. R. P. Smith were the leading spirits. The first was of a somewhat private nature, about one hundred persons being invited to be the guests of Lord Mount Temple at Broadlands Park near Southampton, formerly the residence of Lord Palmerston. For six days in July, from seven in the morning till late at night, the Scripture possibilities of the Christian life as to maintained communion with the Lord and victory over all known sin were eagerly canvassed with absorbing interest and precious results. So manifest was the presence and power of God, and so great the good accomplished—both there and at Langley Park, Norfolk, immediately following—that it was universally felt these meetings must be repeated on a larger scale. A call was accordingly sent out, signed by Mr. Smith at Langley Park, summoning the people to a union meeting for the promotion of scriptural holiness, to be held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874. About one thousand clergy and laity of all denominations, including twenty or thirty prominent ministers from the Continent, spent together a precious ten days, concerning which the universal testimony was that God opened the windows of heaven and poured out marvelous blessings. So intense was the interest aroused, and so unanimous were the testimonies as to the benefit received from great numbers who before had scarcely been in sympathy with such things, that in the following year a still more wonderful convention, also under the presidency of Mr. R. P. Smith, was held at Brighton, from May 29 to June 7, at which nearly eight thousand were present, gathered from all the chief countries of Europe.

One of those who entered into the rest of faith at the Oxford Convention and also participated in the Brighton one was Canon J. Harford-Battersby, Vicar of St. John's, Keswick. He immediately arranged for holding at Keswick, in July of that year, a convention similar to those at Oxford and Brighton. He associated with himself Mr. Robert Wilson, to look after the business arrangements, and some three or four hundred took advantage of the opportunity, the meetings being held in a tent, as they still are. The little band of four or five speakers were all accommodated in the vicar's hospitable home. God was so manifestly with the endeavor that it was continued the next year, and so on down to the present time. Canon Battersby presided as long as he lived, and when he went to heaven, some fourteen years ago, the presidency passed by general assent to Mr. Henry Howker, and at his death to Mr. Robert Wilson. There has, however, never been any fixed committee of control or any very definite organization, except that for many years now Mr. J. Poslethwaite has served very acceptably as secretary in charge of the arrangements, while Mr. Wilson is treasurer of the trustees who hold the property. There is also a separate treasurer, Mr. A. A. Head, of the Keswick Conference Missionary Council, who reported last July—in loans to missionaries, contributions to deputations, grants to the fund for assisting missionaries to attend the convention, and free distribution of *The Life of Faith*, the organ of the Convention, among missionaries abroad—expenditures to the amount of £1,492, leaving a balance on hand of £55. No collections are taken at the meetings, and no appeal for money is ever made to meet expenses, save through boxes provided for voluntary offerings; but the treasury is never empty, and a reserve fund of £2,000 has never been drawn upon. A financial debt or deficiency in connection with Keswick would be as incongruous and impossible as a failure to look into the word for wisdom or up to God for strength.

As to the teaching drawn from the word by these men mighty in prayer, pure in life, and strong in intellect it is, as they all say, in no respect new, but that which has been declared by the evangelical Church from the days of the apostles. The three elementary R's—ruin by the fall, redemption by

the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost—are taken for granted, and on the basis of these fundamentals a larger structure is reared. The main effort is directed toward the deepening and quickening of the spiritual life. A necessity is shown for the readjustment of the relations of the soul to Christ, bringing it into that condition which is everywhere in the New Testament assumed to be the normal state of those who are in Christ and who are therefore following him and denying self. The leaders lay much stress on the necessity for immediate, decisive action by which a person shall become clearly committed to a different line of life from that into which through lukewarmness he has fallen. The Rev. E. H. Hopkins said in a somewhat recent address, in answer to the question, as to the reason the Keswick movement has any power or has made any progress:

> It is because Christian men and women who had been made to know and realize their deep need as Christians were brought into definite blessing—a marked, definite, and divine blessing. There was a crisis in their spiritual life after conversion, a new beginning in their Christian life. They were converted before they understood God's truth or were properly instructed. They needed to be brought into a right attitude to God. There was a hindrance in their practical life that needed to be removed.

The utmost pains is taken, especially in the earlier part of the convention, to get at these many hindrances which are keeping people back from the blessing and the Blesser, to bring those in attendance face to face with God as the Judge, and to produce conviction of need, even of guilt and sin. The tests are very searching and solemn; hearts are probed; whatever impedes progress, even if it cannot be called necessarily sinful, is ferreted out and its absolute abandonment urged. The weights, it is shown, must be laid aside, as well as the glaring transgressions. The self-life—the life that centers in self-dependence, self-seeking, self-choosing—must be renounced; the pleasures of ambition, avarice, appetite, and other forms of selfishness must be resolutely turned from. Those forms of amusement or indulgence that bear the distinctive stamp of this world—such as the dance, the card table, the theater, the opera, the wine cup, and tobacco—naturally rise before the

seeker's conscience at this time. For, while they are seldom referred to specifically at the Keswick gatherings, all who attend find it necessary to face the question of their abandonment, realizing that the believer cannot gain any deep experience of Christ's power while clinging to such amusements, because they exalt self to the throne, and because, however lawful they may be deemed, they do not contribute to the advancement of holiness, and do not edify others, but tend to enslave the soul. All debatable territory is thus swept clear; all doubtful things, "not of faith," and things partaking of the nature of sin are given up for Christ's sake, that God in all things may be pleased and honored. Everything, however trifling or dear, that is found a hindrance to holy living is resolutely abandoned, and the will is surrendered to God in a covenant of complete obedience. The "old man," with all included in that elastic and capacious phrase, is put off, so that the "new man" may be completely put on. This second result, of course, closely follows. The removal of the hindrances at once makes a mighty change in the condition of the soul. Without delay there comes such a flood of the grace of God into the heart that in one hour there is more advance in the divine life than there was before perhaps in ten or twenty years. As soon as the hindrance is gone it is easy to take God at his word in everything, and to believe that what he says he is bound to accomplish. Then comes the indwelling and infilling of the Holy Spirit, on which so much stress is rightly laid, the claiming by the believer of his share in the Pentecostal gift of power for service, and by faith the appropriation of Christ in all his gracious offices.

The holiness taught at Keswick is deliverance from and victory over everything which would hinder the Christian from living a life of entire surrender to Jesus Christ and obedience to his will, and the possession of the fullness of the indwelling Spirit which will cause the Christian to live a loyal obedient life; and this he receives as a free gift by trusting Him who saves to the uttermost. It is characterized by the complete subjection of self and the complete enthronement of Christ; it is a life wholly given up to God for sanctification and service. It is the blessedness of the man who maketh the

Lord his trust, who walks by faith not sight, who presents his body "a living sacrifice," not "conformed to this world" but daily being "transformed by the renewing" of his mind in the ever-advancing and successful search to know what is the "good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God." It includes the passion for souls, conscious fellowship with God, growing possession of the promises, and growing interest in the salvation of all the world. It is a holiness that produces no divisions or discords, but is made a means and bond of union; that is marked by great simplicity and sobriety of thought and feeling, as well as great scripturalness of statement; that, while definite and pointed and thoroughgoing, is full of humble love and remarkably free from crudities and extravagancies whether in word or deed. It is reasonable, practical, and every way sane and solid. No man or woman has ever been known under this teaching to leave one communion for another, nor does it produce self-righteousness and censoriousness. Dr. A. T. Pierson, who has been recognized at Keswick more than once as a highly valued helper, gives this excellent summary of what he counts its definite and unmistakable teaching:

> It affirms a possible and practical deliverance from continuance in known sin, a renewal of the spirit of the mind, a dominion of love, an experience of inward peace; it maintains that it is a sin to be anxious, because where anxiety begins faith ends; that it is not necessary to be under the dominion of any lust of body or mind, to live a life of doubt and despondency or of interrupted communion with God. Forfeited joy means broken fellowship. Keswick maintains that to every trusting, obedient soul, who dares take God at his word and count every commandment an enablement, there is an immediate deliverance from the palsied limbs that make impossible a holy work for God; from the withered hand that prevents a holy work for God; and from the moral deformity that bows one together so that it is impossible to lift up oneself to spiritual uprightness and erectness.

It will be said by some who have not perhaps examined the matter closely that this is precisely the Methodist doctrine of sanctification as taught by Wesley and his followers. This assertion certainly overlooks some variations, but these are mainly, we are glad to think, in points of nomenclature. Perhaps the chief apparent difference is in the extent of sanctifi-

cation, a difference largely accountable, we believe, for the fact that the Wesleyans have held aloof almost entirely from Keswick and have maintained for the past sixteen years a separate "Holiness Convention" at Southport, on whose platform until very recently only Methodists were permitted to speak.

What is the Keswick teaching as to the extent of sanctification? The Rev. F. B. Meyer, in a recent address, remarked:

> On this platform we never say self is dead; were we to do so, self would be laughing at us round the corner. The teaching of Romans vi is not that self is dead, but that the renewed will is dead to self, the man's will saying, "Yes" to Christ and "No" to self; through the Spirit's grace it constantly repudiates and weakens and mortifies the power of the flesh.

Prebendary H. W. Webb-Peploe, in an article contributed in 1898 both to *The Life of Faith* and to *The Sunday School Times*, says:

> It is simply according to our faith that we receive, and faith only draws from God according to our present possibilities. These are limited by the presence of indwelling corruption; and, while never needing to sin within the sphere of the light that we possess, it is ever taught at Keswick—as in every part of God's word—that there are, to the very last hour of our life upon earth, powers of corruption within every man which defile his very best deeds and give to even his holiest efforts that "nature of sin" of which the ninth article in our Church of England Prayer Book speaks so strongly and so scripturally. Hence, while teaching that we need never sin against light, we still hold that, judged by the perfect standard of God, there is the sin of shortcoming and defilement in every thought, word, and deed of our lives.

One more witness may be cited. The Rev. J. Elder Cumming, D.D., in an address delivered at Keswick, on July 28, 1896, entitled "What This Teaching Is," after discussing the process and the power of sanctification, devotes himself to its extent. He says:

> We teach that the Christian life should be one of continuous victory, not of common defeat and occasional triumph; that "God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work;" that God is able perfectly to keep a man from stumbling; that God can do for us what he

did for Paul, who says (1 Cor. iv, 4), "I know nothing against myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord." There is the limit of the extent. A man's conscience may be clear, but that does not say he is a perfect man, that does not say that God sees nothing wrong in him.

From these extracts the position of this band of teachers is sufficiently plain. Is it the same as that of Methodism? In substance we believe it is, but not in appearance or in terminology. And it is more in accordance with the later usages of Methodism—those at present more and more prevailing—than with the former, those coming down from ancient days. There is certainly a decided gap between the language used at a Keswick convention and that used in an ordinary "holiness" camp meeting; but probably not greater than between the expressions current at the latter place and those found in our theological institutions or our more carefully written theological works. It cannot be disguised that the nomenclature of Methodism on this subject from the days of Wesley to the present has been very much mixed and hardly self-consistent, so that quotations in abundance can be given from standard authors on both sides of the important question. For example, Wesley said, near the close of his sermon on the "End of Christ's Coming," "The Son of God does not destroy the whole work of the devil in man as long as he remains in this life." And, since we mean by depravity that abnormal or disordered condition of human nature inaugurated by the devil when he induced man to commit the first sin, it might fairly be said that Wesley believed depravity—or "original sin," as he preferred to term it—must remain with us to some extent while we are in the flesh. On the other hand, he speaks in another place of sanctification as "the recovery of the whole image of God," and again, as "the recovery of the divine nature," "the restoration of the soul to its primitive health, its original purity." He also speaks of the "total death to inbred sin," of the "destruction of the body of sin," of "entire salvation from inbred sin," of "the root of sin being taken away," and of "deliverance from the root of bitterness"—applying these terms to those he called "sanctified," although, as he himself occasionally admits, all believers are sanctified.

Nevertheless, we are disposed to think that, when all of Wesley's words are taken into consideration, the proper conclusion is that he did not really hold to an extent of sanctification essentially different from that taught by the Keswick leaders. The apparent conflict arises simply from the ambiguity of the word "sin" and the use of popular, rather than scientifically accurate, terms. Certainly, about all the later writers* of Methodism who treat this theme are on one side. To quote from only one of these, second to none in ability, we find Professor Beet saying in his masterly study of "Holiness as Understood by the Writers of the Bible:"

> I do not find anywhere in the Bible reason to believe that the inward forces of evil [another expression he uses is "the inward tendency to sin" or "depravity"] may now by our faith, or at any future time in our lives, be utterly annihilated. . . . Unless yielded to, these foulnesses do not defile. . . . Temptation, even though it be from within as the result of previous indulgence in sin, does not defile or weaken until yielded to. Consequently, the promise to cleanse from all sin does not necessarily involve the annihilation of all inward tendencies toward sin. They are conquerors over sin who have completed victory over each temptation as it arises. So long as they abide in faith, the cross of Christ stands as an impassable barrier between them and sin. In this sense, while striving against it they are dead to sin. For the above teaching I cannot claim definitely the authority of Wesley. But, so far as I know, he has not written anything which contradicts it.

The professor rightly says that Wesley's teaching on this matter was "indefinite and incomplete," and that "from some of Wesley's remarks we might infer that in those who put full faith in Christ the curse of original sin is removed." He then adds, "This was not his real meaning." With this conclusion we quite agree. We fully believe that Wesley and Fletcher and the most careful Methodist writers on the subject since are in substantial harmony, when rightly understood, with the Keswick teachers as to the extent of sanctification. They are a unit in the position that it is better to emphasize the glorious possibility of complete deliverance from the power of sin, so that it shall in no sense reign over us, rather than to speculate or dogmatize about the eradication of hypothetical

*Such as Bishop Foster, Bishop Merrill, Dr. Whedon, Dr. Miner Raymond, Professor Joseph Agar Beet, of England, Chancellor Huntington in *Sin and Holiness*, and Mudge in *Growth in Holiness*.

"seeds" or "roots"—very misleading figures, in this connection, and responsible for much mischief.

It would seem that the Keswick movement deserves not only to be carefully studied by Methodists, but to be considerably patterned after. Have we not let a fancied denominational loyalty, or an attachment to traditional orthodoxy, or pride of consistency, or love for old-time terms keep us from accepting what is really excellent in the later methods of promoting the higher, or deeper, Christian life? We are in danger of losing an old leadership in this theme by our unwillingness to admit that mistakes were made in the nomenclature so long ago adopted, mistakes excusable under the peculiar conditions then existing, but not defensible in the present state of biblical scholarship. While we have been stickling for shibboleths and insisting that Wesley's *Plain Account*, written a century and a half ago, is just the thing for to-day, and the only thing, the age has swept on. The books on this theme that now sell by the hundred thousand are by such non-Methodist writers as Mrs. H. W. Smith, F. B. Meyer, Andrew Murray, John McNeill, and others of their class. Their modern methods of statement—simple, natural, reasonable, scriptural—commend their productions to all classes of readers. The revival of genuine godliness which the times demand—and which, please God, is coming—will have its teaching less theological and more scriptural, less controversial and more practical, less emotional and more ethical than heretofore. The cry with us must be, not "Back to the fathers of Methodism," but "Back to the fathers of Christianity, and the New Testament."

It is the testimony of those who attend the Keswick meetings that nothing now on earth seems so closely to reproduce the assemblies of the primitive apostolic Church, that nowhere have they found so well exemplified four great Scripture laws —habitual prayerfulness, prominence of the word of God, unity among all believers, and dependence on the Holy Spirit. Is there not a call for at least one such meeting where, without sensationalism or fanaticism, those who have a definite experience of full salvation and a clear grasp of divine truth concerning it can, as at Keswick, instruct such as are eager to

obtain? We ought to have the men competent to conduct such a gathering—men of deep spirituality and broad in scholarship, level-headed, many-sided, earnest-hearted, ready-tongued—and we ought also to have those willing to dedicate to the purpose whatever financial means may be necessary to put it on its feet. If the Methodism of the twentieth century is to measure up to its opportunities; if it is to escape the perils that beset it because of its numbers, wealth, and popularity; if it is to glow with devotion and shine with the light of God, it must be jealous of its leadership in the matter of the Spirit-filled life, and must hasten to lay hold of every available means that promises to fill its churches with those whose wills are at one with the will divine—those who fear nothing but God, hate nothing but sin, and are ready at any cost to do their utmost for the salvation of the world.



Art. VIII.—DETLEV VON LILIENCRON—A GERMAN SOLDIER POET.

For three quarters of a century Heine has been the real lyric divinity of the Fatherland. His popularity began in the days when old Germany was growing dissatisfied with life, but the dreams and aspirations of young Germany have not lessened his hold upon the hearts of the people. He is still the master of sweet sentiment and romance, as he was when German ballad poetry was bursting its graveclothes for a glorious immortality, and such, doubtless, he will ever be.

But there are some who think differently—some who have the audacity to hold that this Heine worship has gone far enough, and who are now beginning to let their hearts turn unto strange gods. They have the courage of their convictions—these Latter-day Saints in literature, as their enemies might call them—and throw down the gage of battle at every opportunity. And naturally enough battles come, and no end of doughty foemen whose ardor is fanatical. Love potions will not avail them in this contest; people who believe all lyric poetry was born and died with Heinrich Heine, and who answer all arguments on the subject with beer mugs—such people have to be settled with a bludgeon or a battle-ax. Fortunately these revolutionists, these literary rebels, have biographers who study their character and philosophize over their mission. One of these described them thus:

> They are a mixed company. In one sense or another their usefulness is about the same, but their boldness varies greatly. Some are bold because they *are*, some because they *want to be*. Some are full cheeked and ruddy, others ruddy, but neither from health nor shame, for the color on their sunken cheeks is hectic, and in their hollow eyes there burns an uncanny, uneasy, devouring fire, and their foreheads are marked by Venus, not by Urania—stalwart peasant lads and tired metropolitan *fin-de-siècclists*, dreamers of an ideal human state, and such like. Still they are mainly of one heart and soul, and however different their voices sound they sound, nevertheless, and they are their own voices too, not the notes of a hand organ. Such are the "New Toners."

For several years now, Detlev von Liliencron has been a

leading light among these reactionists. His literary career has been one of much discouragement, but also with some fame of a breadless sort. With half pay on the army list—no pay almost on the list of the muses—he has toiled on, living partly in reminiscences of the past, partly in bright hopes of the future when the "New Toners" shall have come into their heritage. And in that day, as Grotthuss says, how much wrong done Von Liliencron must be atoned for:

First from his countrymen, who troubled themselves much more about each new *chansonette* in the Berlin Winter Garden or the Apollo Theater than about one of their own most important poets; then from his small but extremely agile "community," which consists almost entirely of poets. It is, indeed, a pretty sight when, with momentary depreciation of their own services and worth, they lay their homage at the feet of their brother in Apollo; but the clamorous, exuberant, Byzantine manner in which it has been done has not helped him either in poetic development or in public favor. It has held back, widened but not deepened, the former, and kept him away, not to say estranged him, from the latter.

Detlev von Liliencron is a soldier poet. This comes because he has himself been a soldier, tasted the zest of battle, and known the Teuton's fondness for parade. When the music sounds the rabies of war breaks out in his blood. Listen:

Kling-ling, boom-boom, and ching-da-da,
Comes there in triumph the Persian shah?
And round the corner roars this way
The trumpet tone like judgment day—
Ahead the jingling crescent.

Boom-boom, the giant bombardon,
The cymbals' clang, the helicon,
The *piccolo*, the cornet's strain,
The Turkish drum, the flute's refrain,
And then the gallant captain.

The captain comes in proud disdain,
Beneath his chin the helmet chain,
The sash is girt around his waist—
By Zeus! this is not time misplaced—
And then the bold lieutenants.

Rose-red and brown, lieutenants two,
The flag they guard with valor true;

And hats come off, the flag draws nigh,
For it we fight till hour to die,
And then the grenadiers, O!

The grenadiers with sturdy tramp,
In stamp and step, and step and stamp,
That sounds and beats and rings and quakes;
The lantern jars, and window shakes,
And then the little maidens.

Ranged head to head the maidens there,
With eyes so blue and braids so fair,
From door and gate and houses near
Mina and Trina and Tina peer,
But past is now the music.

Kling-ling, ching-ching, and roar of drum,
Now from the distance does it come,
Quite softly, boom-boom, ching,
Was that an insect fluttering,
Ching-ching, boom, round the corner?

Sometimes, when twilight has come at the close of a perfect day, Detlev von Liliencron falls into a reminiscent mood. He is such a typical son of the North, has such an inborn love for breezy moorlands and sport and war, that he cannot shake himself loose from the memory of his earlier years—though he is by no means old—when, as he himself confesses in some charming words of self-biography, to wander with dog and gun through forest and over heath made a day worth living. And then the provinces he visited in his soldier career, the garrison towns he lived in, the three wars he fought through —what a background against which to frame his longings and daydreams! "O thou lieutenant time! with thy jolly healthfulness, thy keenness, thy many friends and comrades; with all thy rosy days, thy punctilious feeling of duty, thy stern self-discipline!" Of such feelings is born the exquisite poem which Von Liliencron calls "The Tattoo:"

Up comes the very last tent pin,
Accouter'd all, the men fall in,
Tight buckled every girth is;
The flood of iron melts all around
Like snow of March o'er sunny ground,
And reeking now the earth is.

Like flow'rets in their summer bed,
Like flow'rets blue and flow'rets red,
  There gleams the foe's bright jacket;
Soon everywhere the deadly crash,
The shells are tearing flesh from flesh,
  As gallows ravens hack it.

Ahead the colonel, in gold bedeckt,
His collar soiled and blood befleckt,
  Is bound to gain the glory;
Already him the bullet seams,
The saber shines, the saber gleams,
  And hoofs tread forms all gory.

Then comes the dart fashion'd for him,
The dart is fine and point so slim,
  He falls in forward breastwork;
And over him, as yarn winds out,
Pile wheel and horse in maddened route,
  A snakelike tangled nest-work.

That all was ten long years agone,
Through many leaves the wind has blown
  O'er grave and bridal scattered;
The colonel pines in garden's ease—
There is the gallant Achilles,
  And cane, not weapons battered.

The night is hot, he sits alone,
He sits in light of bright full moon,
  His thoughts are sad and fleeting;
When suddenly a faint tone hears,
Yet one, but hark! the tone it nears,
  Kling-ling, and drums a-beating.

And nearer yet the music comes,
And through the air the tumult hums,
  And nearer, ever nearer;
The old man's soul it sweeps afar—
Drums beating time and battle jar—
  His heart feels drear and drear'er.

The battalion moves to town close by,
From whence, in quarters ever nigh,
  It greets the warrior agèd,
And brings to him the tattoo call,
Which sweeps up like the storm's onfall,
  And stops, its force assuagèd.

Yet what a pleasure for him thought
Has only sorrow to him brought,
  And memories oppress him;

In strength and valor proud, on steed,
And princelike there the host to lead—
These thoughts do now possess him.

The music wanes and torchlight glare,
The town absorbs the furious blare,
And leaves the old man dreaming;
The valkyrs passed there in the night
And lifted him from settle light—
Away, and colors streaming!

But our singer is not complete master of the poesy of pathos till he catches his inspiration from some simple summer landscape which has been stained by the carnage of battle. In his "Dead in the Wheat" he is at his best:

In wide wheat field, in poppies gay,
There lies a soldier yet unfound;
Two days and nights have passed away,
His painful wounds as yet unbound.

In racking thirst and fever mad
He lifts his head in power of death—
A fleeting dream, a vision sad—
He looks on high and gasps for breath.

The sickle cleaves the field of wheat,
He sees his village calm, content;
"Adieu, adieu, thou homeland sweet,"
And drops his head, and life is spent.

Another fact from the poet's biography cannot fail to be of interest to people on the new side of the ocean. He tells it himself: "I was born at Kiel, June 3, 1844. My brothers and sisters early had to fold their little hands in their coffins. My sainted mother, Adeline Sylvestra, *née* Von Harten, was born in Philadelphia, where my grandfather was an American general. Though younger by half his life, he was one of the last, true friends of the great Washington." From these words we can easily see why Detlev von Liliencron is a soldier and sings in his clearest tones of the work of war; in doing so he is but living out the strain of family history.

R. Clyde Ford

Art. IX.—THE CORRESPONDENCE OF JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

It has been said that the days of the art of letter writing are forever past; that the telephone, the telegraph, the typewriter, and the modern newspaper have reduced the epistles that pass between friends to the exchange of the merest conventional civilities. In these strenuous and rushing years little opportunity is found to enjoy the pleasant and gossipy leisureliness of the old-time letter writers. The letters of Cowper, of Dean Swift, of Keats, of Landor, of Carlyle, and his brilliant wife, of Emerson, of the two Brownings, and, we might add, of R. L. Stevenson will never be duplicated, because *tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.* And yet, down to the very year of his death, the letters of Lowell were the same delightful, lucid, and witty expressions of a charming personality. In them are quaint bits of observation, wise and incisive comments upon men and things, sudden revelations of a heart overflowing with love, passages as bright with humor as anything that appears in the *Moosehead Journal*, erudite allusions, and quotations from the most diverse sources, until it would seem that the advent of one of these letters must have been marked as an important event in the experience of the recipient.

James Russell Lowell first opened his eyes to the light of the natural sun in Cambridge, Mass., on February 22, 1819, a day noted in the calendar of American patriotism as the one made memorable by the nativity of the immortal Washington. Lowell was most fortunate in his antecedents. His father was a cultured clergyman, a lover of books and of the benign and beautiful things of life. The poet's mother was of an ancient Orkney family, and through her there was filtered into the blood of the son the solitude and romantic mystery of those northern islands. Lowell's early home was such as would foster the poetic instincts of a child. Elmwood, a product of colonial times, stood in the midst of lawn and garden, orchard and English elms. It was a roomy old-fashioned house, rising amid its rural surroundings, with an

air of quiet respectability all its own. There were five other children in the Lowell household, three brothers and two sisters, all older than the poet. He was an ardent little fellow, loving boyish pastimes, and was happy and healthy in affections and temperament as a boy should be. We may obtain a glimpse of his joyous childhood from the following letter to his brother Robert, written seventy-one years ago:

My Dear Brother,—I am now going to tell you melancholy news. I have got the ague together with a gumbile. I presume you know that September has got a lame leg, but he grows better every day and now is very well but still limps a little. We have a new scholar from round hill. his name is Hooper and we expect another named Penn who I believe also comes from there. The boys are all very well except Nemaise, who has got another piece of glass in his leg and is waiting for the doctor to take it out, and Samuel Storrow is also sick. I am going to have a new suit of blue broadcloth clothes to wear every day and to play in. Mother tells me that I may have any sort of buttons I choose. I have not done anything to the hut but if you wish I will. I am now very happy; but I should be more so if you were there. I hope you will answer my letter if you do not I shall write you no more letters. when you write my letters you must direct them all to me and not write half to mother as generally do. Mother has given me three volumes of tales of a grandfather.

farewell

Yours truly

James R. Lowell.

You must excuse me for making so many mistakes. You must keep what I have told you about my new clothes a secret if you dont I shall not divulge any more secrets to you. I have got quite a library. The Master has not taken his rattan out since the vacation. Your little kitten is as well and as playful as ever and I hope you are to for I am sure I love you as well as ever. Why is grass like a mouse you cant guess that he he he ho ho ho ha ha ha hum hum hum.

Lowell matriculated at Harvard as a freshman, when he was fifteen years of age. Although somewhat diffident, he made friends among his classmates, and found much enjoyment in his college days. In a letter written to W. H. Shackford, in 1836, the critical habit of Lowell's mind already begins to appear. He says:

I am reading the life of Milton, and find it very interesting; his first taste (as well as Cowley's) for poetry was formed by reading Spenser. I am glad to have such good examples, for Spenser was always my favor-

ite poet. I like the meter of the "Faerie Queene;" Beattie's "Minstrel" is in the same. Apropos of poetry, I myself (you need not turn up your nose and grin)—yes, I myself have cultivated the muses, and have translated one or two odes from Horace, your favorite Horace. I like Horace much, but prefer Virgil's "Bucolics" to his "Odes," most of them. If you have your Horace by you, turn to the IXth Satire, 1st Book, and read it, and see if you don't like it (in an expurgated edition).

In a letter to G. B. Loring, written in the same year as the foregoing, we have another allusion to the fact that he has begun the writing of poetry:

Here I am, alone in Bob's room with a blazing fire, in an atmosphere of "poesy" and soft-coal smoke. Hope, Dante, a few of the older English poets, Byron, and last, not least, some of my own compositions, lie around me. Mark my modesty. I don't put myself in the same line with the rest, you see.

Writing to W. H. Shackford the following year, he gives apparently the first intimation of what his pursuit in life shall be: "I thought your brother Charles was studying law. I intend to study that myself, and probably shall be Chief Justice of the United States."

That dominant love for the home of his birth and childhood, which made Lowell cling to Elmwood to the closing day of his life, he expresses in another letter to Loring, penned April 5, 1837:

To revisit the home of one's childhood has much of joy, but it is a joy mingled with sadness. To think how soon those flowers that have bloomed, those fields that have smiled, and those trees that have so often arrayed themselves in "summer's garb" for you, may bloom and smile and array themselves for another! You may think me a fool to talk in such a moralizing strain, but, George, I have lately talked less and thought more. I mean to read next term, if possible, a chapter in my Bible every night.

The increasingly studious habits of his mind and that *bonhomie* which were characteristic of Lowell throughout his later life are now (1837) well defined:

I am busy as a bee—almost. I study and read and write all the time. I have laid my hands on a very pretty edition of Cowper, which I intend to keep. In two volumes I have also "pinned" some letters relating to myself in my early childhood, by which it seems I was a miracle of a boy

for sweetness of temper. "*Credite posteri!*" I believe I was, although perhaps you would not think it now.

Already, in this same year, he begins to find himself able to express his intense love of nature:

You can't imagine how delightful it is out here. The greatest multitude of birds of every description that I ever recollect to have seen. The grass is fast growing green under the kind sun of spring—that is, in southerly aspects. Every day that the sun shines I take my book and go out to a bank in our garden, and lie and read. 'Tis almost as pleasant as

To sit on rocks, to muse o'er flood and fell.

. . . The birds now sing loudest, and the fowling piece breaks "the quiet of the scene" less often than at any other time. Besides, 'tis beautiful to watch the different steps of nature's toilet, as she arrays herself in the flowery dress of Spring. It almost seems as if one could see the grass grow green. Then, too, the sky is so clear.

Years after this impression of his love for nature Lowell wrote in the same spirit as follows:

The older I grow the more I am convinced that there are no satisfactions so deep and so permanent as our sympathies with outward nature. I have not said just what I meant, for we are thrilled even more by any spectacle of human heroism. But the others seem to bind our lives together by a more visible and unbroken chain of purifying and softening emotion. In this way the flowering of the buttercups is always a great, and I may truly say religious, event in my year. . . . There never was such a season, if one only did not have to lecture and write articles. There never is such a season, and that shows what a poet God is. He says the same thing over to us so often, and always new. Here I've been reading the same poem for near half a century, and never had a notion what the buttercups in the third stanza meant before. But I won't tell.

In one of his early letters, written while he is rusticating in Concord for having neglected certain studies of the college curriculum, he thus mentions Thoreau: "I met Thoreau last night, and it is exquisitely amusing to see how he imitates Emerson's tone and manner. With my eyes shut, I shouldn't know them apart."

The decidedly poetical bias of Lowell's nature is now clearly apparent. "I have been reading the first volume of Carlyle's *Miscellanies*," he writes. "One article, that on Burns, is worth all the rest to me. I like, too, the one on German playwrights. There are fine passages in all." About this time

there was some thought upon the part of the poet of entering a divinity school, that he might prepare himself for the ministry. He seems to have been possessed of very distinct notions with regard to a clergyman's condition as related to his work, and reached the conclusion that he was not adapted to the minister's vocation. He says:

No man ought to be a minister who has not a special calling that way. I don't mean an old-fashioned special calling, with winged angels and fat-bottomed cherubs, but an inward one. In fact, I think that no man ought to be a minister who has not money enough to support him besides his salary. For the minister of God should not be thinking of his own and children's bread, when dispensing the bread of life. I have been led to reflect seriously on the subject since I have thought of going into the divinity school. Some men were made for peacemakers and others for shoemakers, and if each man follow his nose we shall come out right at last. If I did not think that I should some day make a great fool of myself and marry (not that I would call all men fools who marry), I would enter the school to-morrow. Certain am I that it is not pleasant to work for a living anyway, but "we youth" must live, and verily this "money" is a very good thing, though on that account we need not fall down and worship it. The very cent on which my eye now rests may have done a great deal of good in its day; perhaps it has made glad the heart of the widow, and put a morsel of bread in the famishing mouths of her children; and perhaps it has created much misery; perhaps some now determined gambler began his career of sin by playing chuck-farthing with that very piece of stamped copper.

In this same letter his burning love of liberty, which seemed to intensify with passing years, obtains a tentative utterance that came to its culmination long afterward in the noble "Commemoration Ode:"

A plan has been running in my head, for some time, of writing a sort of dramatic poem on the subject of Cromwell. Those old Roundheads have never had justice done them. They have only been held up as canting, psalm-singing, hypocritical rascals; as a sort of a foil for the open-hearted Cavalier. But it were a strange thing indeed if there were not somewhat in such men as Milton, Sidney, Hampden, Selden, and Pym. It always struck me that there was more true poetry in those old fiery-eyed, buff-belted warriors—with their deep, holy enthusiasm for liberty and democracy, political and religious; with their glorious trust in the arm of the Lord in battle—than in the dashing, ranting Cavaliers, who wished to restore their king that they might give vent to their passions, and go to sleep again in the laps of their mistresses, deaf to the cries of the poor and the oppressed.

After the final relinquishment of his nascent purpose of entering the ministry Lowell turned his attention to the study of law, but only at intervals and in a desultory and half-hearted manner. He says:

I am reading Blackstone with as good a grace and as few wry faces as I may. . . . A very great change has come o'er the spirit of my dream of life. I have renounced the law. I am going to settle down into a business man at last, after all I have said to the contrary. Farewell! a long farewell, to all my greatness! I find that I cannot bring myself to like the law, and I am now looking out for a place "in a store." You may imagine that all this has not come to pass without a struggle. . . . I have been thinking seriously of the ministry, but then—I have also thought of medicine, but then—still worse! . . . On Monday last I went into town to look out for a place, and was induced *en passant* to step into the United States Court, where there was a case pending in which Webster was one of the counsel retained. I had not been there an hour before I determined to continue in my profession and study as well as I could.

The vacillation of Lowell's mind at this period with regard to his life pursuit is well portrayed by the foregoing quotations. The poet's interest in matters of public concern had already been kindled, although he was still ineligible to vote, not yet having come of age. In view of the *Biglow Papers* and their influence upon their time, and also of Lowell's brilliant career as the representative of his country at the Spanish court and at the Court of St. James, some of the lines in a letter written November 15, 1838, seem to be almost prophetic:

I shouldn't wonder if the peaceable young gentleman whom you know in college flared up into a great political luminary. I am fast becoming ultra-democratic, and when I come to see you, which I trust will be very soon, I intend to inoculate you with the (I won't call it by the technical term of "virus," because that's too hard a word, but with the) principle. . . . By the very last accounts from England, immense meetings had been held in all parts of England to petition Parliament for an equal representation. . . . There is a great and pregnant change, ominous of much. It almost brings tears into my eyes when I think of this vast multitude starved, trampled upon, meeting to petition the government which oppressed them, and which they supported by taxes wrung out of the very children's lifeblood. Verily, some enthusiasts have even ventured to assert that there are hearts, aye, even warm ones, under frieze jerkins.

Again Lowell swings toward the law, with the pathetic tergiversation characteristic of so many young men groping toward their lifework. In these days of large prices for famous names and commonplace performances, it is rather wholesome to note the highest fees to which Lowell aspired in payment for a lecture:

> The more I think of business, the more really unhappy do I feel and think more and more of studying law. In your letter you speak of my lecturing in Andover, about which I forgot to speak to you. Do they pay expenses? They gave me four dollars in Concord. I wish they'd take it into their heads to ask me at Cambridge, where they pay fifteen dollars, or in Lowell where they pay twenty-five dollars!! What to do with myself I don't know.

Lowell had been accused of indolence by his friends. The accusation seems to have had a basis of fact, and the poet himself recognized it. Yet it has ever been so with those possessed of poetical genius; it comes to its best only in that atmosphere of leisureliness and contentment wherein indeed the

> . . . Spirit lies
> Under the walls of Paradise.

Here is the young writer's confession: "I am lazy enough and dilatory enough, heaven knows, but not half so much so as some of my friends suppose. At all events, I was never made for a merchant, and I even begin to doubt whether I was made for anything in particular but to loiter through life."

In view of the eagerness with which publishers afterward sought the work of Lowell's pen, the desire expressed to publish a volume of his poems is curiously striking:

> If I could get any bookseller to do it for me, I would publish a volume of poems. Of late a fancy has seized me for so doing. If it met with any commendation I could get paid for contributions to periodicals. I tried last night to write a little rhyme—but must wait for the moving of the waters. The nine goddess virgins who dance with tender feet round the violet-hued fountain of Hippocrene, and whose immortal voices drop sweetly from their lips, will not come to me.

Apropos of his relation to the law he writes again, in 1839:

> If I live, I don't believe I shall ever (between you and me) practice law. I intend, however, to study it and prepare myself for practicing.

But a blind presentiment of becoming independent in some other way is always hovering round me. Above all things should I love to be able to sit down and do something literary for the rest of my natural life.

The first mention of Miss Maria White, afterward Mrs. Lowell, we find in a letter addressed by Lowell to G. B. Loring, and bearing date December 2, 1839:

I went up to Watertown on Saturday with W. A. White, and spent the Sabbath with him. You ought to see his father. The most perfect specimen of a bluff, honest, hospitable country squire you can possibly imagine. His mother, too, is a very pleasant woman—a sister of Mrs. Gilman. His sister is a very pleasant and pleasing young lady, and knows more poetry than anyone I am acquainted with. I mean she is able to repeat more. She is more familiar, however, with modern poets than with the pure wellsprings of English poesy.

Lowell completed his studies at the Harvard Law School in 1840, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Laws. His father had suffered financial reverses, and the poet now found himself confronted with the necessity of earning his own livelihood. In these straits, as other good men have done in all ages, Lowell became engaged to be married. Miss Maria White was a woman of uncommon personal attractiveness, and her mental endowments were of a high order. She, too, wrote poetry, and thus was peculiarly fitted to sympathize with the tastes and aspirations of her gifted husband. About this time Lowell concluded to collect his poems for publication, which he did under the title of *A Year's Life.* The little book at once gave its author an assured place among his younger poetical compeers. Lowell published his second volume of verse in 1843, and this second venture afforded indubitable evidence of maturing power. In 1844 Lowell published a volume of prose consisting of *Conversation on Some of the Old Poets.* The critical and analytical bent of his mind was now well determined, and the work in this book already showed elements of future power. At the close of this year Lowell married, despite his very limited and precarious income. He began to write for antislavery organs, and, being deeply moved by the noblest humanitarian instincts, he gave utterance week after week to sentiments that stirred like a bugle blast. Thus the *Biglow Papers* began to appear, and were at once received

with an expression of popular favor which has never changed. In 1848 they were issued in a volume, and in the same year the *Fable for Critics* and the *Vision of Sir Launfal* were written and published.

The growing temper of Lowell's mind is well illustrated by the following lines which appear in letters written in 1841:

I know that God has given me powers such as are not given to all, and I will not "hide my talent in mean clay." I do not care what others may think of me or of my book, because if I am worth anything I shall one day show it. I do not fear criticism so much as I love truth. Nay, I do not fear it at all. In short, I am happy. Maria fills my ideal, and I satisfy hers. And I mean to live as one beloved by such a woman should live. She is every way noble. People have called "Irene" a beautiful piece of poetry. And so it is. It owes all its beauty to her. . . . I have just finished something which I ought to have done long ago. I have copied off a ballad of mine for a publisher of the name of D. H. Williams, who is getting out an annual. He will pay me five dollars per page, and more if the book sells well. Hawthorne, Emerson, and Longfellow are writing for it, and Bryant and Halleck have promised to—so I shall be in good company, which will be pleasing to groundlings.

At times Lowell bubbled over with fun and animal spirits; he would then pour out sufficient original wit and humor to have supplied a professional humorist with a working capital for several years:

The next day I was up before sunrise, and got into a habit of early rising that lasted me all that day. . . . I have nothing else in the way of novelty, except an expedient I hit upon for my hens who were backward with their eggs. On rainy days I set William to reading aloud to them the *Lay Sermons* of Coleridge, and the effect was magical. Whether their consciences were touched or they wished to escape the preaching, I know not. . . . I take great comfort in God. I think he is considerably amused with us sometimes, but that he like us, on the whole, and would not let us get at the match box so carelessly as he does unless he knew that the frame of his universe was fireproof. . . . As usual I haven't left myself time to correct my proofs. What a pleasant life I shall have of it when I have all eternity on deposit. Then the printers will say, "If you can with convenience return proofs before end of next century, you would oblige; but there is no hurry." 'Tis an invincible argument for immortality that we never have time enough here —except for doing other things.

Again and again Lowell reveals the extreme affectionateness of his nature:

You say that life seems to be a struggle after nothing in particular. But you are wrong. It is a struggle after the peaceful home of the soul in a natural and loving state of life. Men are mostly unconscious of the object of their struggle, but it is always connected in some way with this. If they gain wealth and power or glory, it is all to make up for this want, which they feel, but scarce know what it is. But nothing will ever supply the place of this, any more than their softest carpets will give their old age the spring and ease which arose from the pliant muscles of youth. . . . It is always my happiest thought that with all the drawbacks of temperament (of which no one is more keenly conscious than myself) I have never lost a friend. For I would rather be loved than anything else in the world. I always thirst after affection, and depend more on the expression of it than is altogether wise.

The strongly altruistic tendencies of Lowell's mind are observable in the views which he expressed upon the question of slavery:

If men will not set their faces against this monstrous sin, this *choragus* of all other enormities, they, at least, need not smile upon it, much less write in its favor. What, in the name of God, are all these paltry parties, which lead men by the nose against all that is best and holiest, to the freedom of five millions of men? The horror of slavery can only be appreciated by one who has felt it himself, or who has imagination enough to put himself in the place of the slave and fancy himself not only virtually imprisoned, but forced to toil; and all this for no crime and for no reason except that it would be inconvenient to free them.

That Lowell was possessed of a deeply spiritual nature none who are well acquainted with his writings will be disposed to deny. He seemed to be always conscious of the divine Immanence, and undoubtedly the sense of God's presence and overruling providence lent grandeur and dignity to his thought and life. He says:

I had a revelation last Friday evening. I was at Mary's, and happening to say something of the presence of spirits (of whom, I said, I was often dimly aware), Mr. Putnam entered into an argument with me on spiritual matters. As I was speaking, the whole system rose up before me like a vague destiny looming from the abyss. I never before so clearly felt the spirit of God in me and around me. The whole room seemed to me full of God. The air seemed to waver to and fro with the presence of something, I knew not what. I spoke with the calmness and clearness of a prophet.

In his young manhood Lowell was filled with the fine and brave enthusiasms of youth. His wings were light and strong, and to him no height seemed beyond his reach. His buoyant spirits responded swiftly to every change for the better in the material circumstances of his life. He looked upon his conquest of the world as already assured, and the event proved the justice of his judgment:

I have set about making myself ambitious. It is the only way to climb well. Men yield more readily to an ambitious man, provided he can bear it out by deeds. Just as much as we claim the world gives us, and posterity has enough to do in nailing the base coin to the counter. But I only mean to use my ambition as a staff to my love of freedom and man. I will have power, and there's the end of it. I have a right to it, too, and you see I have put the crown on already.

To the bereaved friend the poet, who himself had lost a darling child, and who was again to pass through the swelling of the great waters, thus addresses himself concerning death and sorrow:

I agree entirely with what you have said of death in your last letter; but at the same time I know well that the first touch of his hand is cold, and that he comes to us, as the rest of God's angels do, in disguise. But we are enabled to see his face fully at last, and it is that of a seraph. So it is with all. Disease, poverty, death, sorrow all come to us with unbenign countenances; but from one after another the mask falls off, and we behold faces which retain the glory and the calm of having looked in the face of God. To me, at least, your bereavement has come with the softest step and the most hallowed features, for it has opened a new channel for my love to flow toward you in. . . . It is therefore no idle form when I tell you to lean on God. I know that it is needless to say this to you, but I know also that it is always sweet and consoling to have our impulses seconded by the sympathy of our friends.

> We all are tall enough to reach God's hand,
> The angels are no taller.

I could not restrain my tears when I read what you say of the living things all around the cast mantle of your child. It is strange, almost awful, that, when this great miracle has been performed for us, nature gives no sign. Not a bee stints his hum, the sun shines, the leaves glisten, the cock crow comes from the distance, the flies buzz into the room, and yet perhaps a minute before the most immediate presence of God of which we can conceive was filling the whole chamber, and opening its arms to "suffer the little ones to come unto him."

The filial love and reverence that a child owes to a worthy parent Lowell has expressed in lines which fairly throb with warm and deep affection. His portrait of his father is as unstudied as it is delightful, but want of space forbids its presentation here. The manner in which scholars gather knowledge by processes of accretion Lowell has indicated with his accustomed freshness and originality:

> If you had cast about for a hard question to ask me, you could not have been more successful than in desiring my advice as to a course of reading. I suppose that very few men who are bred scholars ever think of such a thing as a course of reading after their Freshman year in college. Their situation throws books constantly in their way, and they select by a kind of instinct the food which will suit their mental digestion, acquiring knowledge insensibly, as the earth gathers soil. This was wholly the case with myself.

Having been taken to task for entertaining the principles of an abolitionist, and in like manner having been accused of one-sidedness, Lowell thus proceeds to defend himself:

> There is one abolitionist, at least, who seldom lets slip any opportunity against any institution which seems to him to stand in the way of freedom. Absolute freedom is what I want—for the body first, and then for the mind. For the body first, because it is easier to make men conscious of the wrong of that grosser and more outward oppression, and, after seeing that, they will perceive more readily the less palpable chains and gags of tyranny.

That erratic, irresponsible, iconoclastic free lance of letters, Edgar Allan Poe, who ran atilt at most of his fellow-writers in his own day, did not permit Lowell to escape. In common with Longfellow and others already eminent in literature, Poe accused Lowell of plagiarism. Lowell thus repels the charge:

> Poe, I am afraid, is wholly lacking in that element of manhood which, for want of a better name, we call "character." It is something quite distinct from genius—though all great geniuses are endowed with it. . . . As I prognosticated, I have made Poe my enemy by doing him a service. Poe wishes to kick down the ladder by which he rose. He is welcome. But he does not attack me at a weak point. He probably cannot conceive of anybody's writing for anything but a newspaper reputation, or for posthumous fame, which is but the same thing magnified by distance. I have quite other aims.

In this same letter, from which the foregoing quotation is

made, Lowell permits us to look for a moment into the depths of his heart, where he reveals his intense longing for sympathy and love. Could we gaze below the cold exterior of many a person whose pathway for an instant crosses our own, we doubtless would be astonished to learn how, in the largest and purest natures, this yearning for human fellowship rises into a very passion. Lowell's conception of the office of a poet was a lofty one. His charming and beautiful prose did not possess in his own eyes a hundredth part of the value of his poetry. His desire was to live and be remembered by what he had done in the poetic field. He was conscious of his high calling, and attained to rare moments of prophetic power and vicarious suffering:

> My calling is clear to me. I am never lifted up to any peak of vision —and moments of almost fearful inward illumination I have sometimes —but that, when I look down in hope to see some valley of the Beautiful Mountains, I behold nothing but blackened ruins; and the moans of the downtrodden the world over—but chiefly here in our own land—come up to my ear, instead of the happy songs of the husbandmen reaping and binding the sheaves of light; yet these, too, I hear not seldom. Then I feel how great is the office of poet, could I but even dare to hope to fill it.

The mutual helpfulness which lies at the foundation of all true democracy is not always recognized, particularly by those who, because of birth, training, and education, should be first to embody in their own lives the fact that *noblesse oblige*. But with Lowell democracy in its widest and truest sense was almost a religion. All great genius has been allied with a youthful temperament that never aged. In fact, genius itself, as a subtle prophylactic against time, is a preservative of the simple beliefs, elasticity, and fire of youth, to which the vision of the world is ever fair and bright. Whatever epigraphs time may score upon the brow, or howsoever upon hollow temples he may dust his rime, genius permits no wrinkles to come upon the heart. The selfsame hopefulness and high-heartedness of early years are borne lightly onward to the very end of life. It was so with Lowell.

How much a matter of conscience Lowell's antislavery sentiments were may be discovered from the fact that he was reluctant to take pay for the articles which he produced in behalf

of the cause so dear to his heart. Whatever the acknowledged charms of Lowell the author—and they are many—they were eclipsed by the charming personality of Lowell the man. It should ever be thus. The writer who is not greater than his writings is a kind of an impostor, for he creates in the minds of others a false conception of himself. That Lowell never lost a friend who really knew him need not be regarded as surprising. "If I did not think that I were better than my books," he says, "I should never dream of writing another." He cherished a perpetual and consuming desire to fulfill the expectations of his friends. He knew that they anticipated great things for him, and he set about to realize these anticipations. At the same time he felt that his poetical power and skill were increasing, and he looked into the future with the resilience of hope based upon praiseworthy performance. His never-failing kindliness of heart and invincible good humor helped him over not a few of the rough places of life. He was able to see the humorous side of almost every situation, so that difficulties which would have dismayed many another man were for him minified to the vanishing point. Nor was he afraid of dealing with some of the most perplexing of the ethical problems of the world. He looked upon human nature with a clear and tolerant eye, and he never despaired of the ultimate elevation of humanity. His attitude toward the Author of the Christian faith was one of deepest reverence and unchanging love.

Death was not idle in the poet's life. His dear children were taken from him, one by one—with the exception of his daughter Mabel—and all too soon his beautiful and beloved wife. In the loss of the latter Lowell drank of the bitterest cup that can be pressed to the lips of man. She was a fragile creature of fire and dew, and the end approached so insidiously under cover of a constitutional delicacy of health that it took the poet by a heartbreaking surprise. This great sorrow wore him down, but his faith and resignation rose triumphant above the affliction.

In the opening months of 1855 he was elected to a professorship in Harvard College—a chair which had previously been occupied by Ticknor and Longfellow. Lowell entered

upon the duties of his new position on his return from Europe, in 1856. He continued in this relation for twenty years. In 1857 he also became editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, "sitting in the seat of the scorner," as he expressed it, for four consecutive years. At the end of this period he became associated with Charles Eliot Norton in the joint editorship of the *North American Review*. During the soul-trying years of our civil war his was a puissant voice lifted in defense of the Union. The mounting fire and passion of his patriotism culminate in the splendid "Commemoration Ode," which seems to have been written with his very heart's blood. Lowell was always pleased at any recognition of his work as a poet. He felt that he had in him all the elements of the highest poetical achievements, and in consequence looked with a certain dissatisfaction upon his best productions as falling far below his own ideal of excellence and of possibility. He was always conscious, also, notwithstanding the general buoyancy of his nature, that upon him, as upon all great sensitive souls, pressed the inescapable *wettschmerz* which haunts these years of time.

Many of Lowell's utterances might pass current as proverbs, so trenchant are they and bite with such power into the memory:

He cannot be a wise man who never says a foolish thing, and, indeed, I go further, and affirm that it takes a wise man to say a foolish thing. . . . We never find out on how many insignificant points we have fastened the subtile threads of association—which is almost love with sanguine temperaments—till we are forced to break them. . . . We shall never feather our nests from the eagles we have let fly. . . . It is splendid, as girls say, to dream backward so. One feels as if he were a poet, and one's own Odyssey sings itself in one's blood as he walks. . . . What a web a man can spin out of his life, if a man be only a genius. . . . I have discovered that it is almost impossible to learn all about anything unless indeed it be some piece of ill luck, and then one has the help of one's friends. . . . But let us have a cheerful confidence that we are worth damning, for that implies a chance also of something better. . . . I believe it one of the most happy things in the world, as we grow older, to have as many ties as possible with whatever is best in our own past, and to be pledged as deeply as may be to our own youth. . . . That friendship should be able to endure silence without suspicion is the surest touchstone of its sufficiency. . . . I have always believed that a man's fate is born with him, and that he cannot

escape from it nor greatly modify it—and that consequently everyone gets in the long run exactly what he deserves, neither more nor less. . . . If a man does anything good, the world always finds it out, sooner or later; and if he doesn't, why, the world finds that out, too—and ought to. . . . Women need social stimulus more than we [men]. They contribute to it more, and their magnetism, unless drawn off by the natural conductors, turns inward and irritates. . . . I look upon a belief as none the worse, but rather the better, for being hereditary, prizing as I do whatever helps to give continuity to the being and doing of man and an accumulated force to his character. . . . They go about to prove to me from a lot of nasty savages that conscience is a purely artificial product, as if that wasn't the very wonder of it. What odds whether it is the thing or the aptitude that is innate? What race of beasts ever got one up in all their leisurely æons? . . . I don't care where the notion of immortality came from. If it sprang out of a controlling necessity of our nature, some instinct of self-protection and preservation, like the color of some of Darwin's butterflies, at any rate it is there and as real as that, and I mean to hold it fast.

The unfolding of a commanding intellect always presents a fascinating study, and hence the writer of these lines has purposely lingered over the earlier portion of Lowell's life as we find it expressed in his letters. His high place as a poet is so widely recognized that no words in emphasis of that fact are needed here. As a critic he brought to bear upon his task a kindly disposition, a culture broad and exact, and a catholicity of taste equaled only by the acumen of his mind. His perception of high qualities seemed to be instinctive. The slashing, swashbuckling style of criticism which prevailed about the middle of the present century Lowell wholly eschewed, and perhaps for the first time on this side of the Atlantic there was apparent an earnest and painstaking effort to ascertain the real content of a piece of literary art. Over all his writing, likewise, in whatever kind, there played an ever various and subtle humor like iridescent light.

James B. Kenyon.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

THE New York *Observer* wisely says:

Criticism of a sort must be; but the proper spirit of Scripture study is indicated in the words that John Brown, when in prison, wrote in the Bible, which, just before his execution, he gave to a friend: "There is no commentary in the world so good in order to a right understanding of this blessed Book as an honest, child-like, and teachable spirit."

OF a certain professor's mechanical comments on Stedman's *American Anthology*, a literary critic writes:

It is very wonderful to see how a statistician, who has stumbled into the Chair of Literature instead of that of Agricultural Chemistry, which he might conceivably have adorned, can produce a quantitative instead of a qualitative analysis, as the thing which it behooves to be done. *The ultimate moral seems to be that a man needs an unusual degree of sense in order to trust himself in a position in which nobody can "talk back" to him, on the papal throne, in the pulpit, on the bench, or in a professor's chair.* When he does not exhibit that eminence of wisdom we see what happens to him. Upon a mind not apparently extraordinary from the first, the habitual practice of telling boys, without fear of contradiction, things which are either irrelevant or "not so," must, in the long run, most unfavorably react.

THE following brings out Carlyle's emphasis on the dignity of work as work:

Two men I honor, and no third. First the toilworn Craftsman that with earth-made implement laboriously conquers the Earth, and makes her man's—Venerable to me is the hard hand, crooked, coarse; wherein notwithstanding lies a cunning virtue, indefeasibly royal, as of the Scepter of this Planet. Venerable too is the rugged face, all weather tanned, besoiled, with its rude intelligence; for it is the face of a man living manlike. O, but the more venerable for thy rudeness, and even because we must pity as well as love thee! Hardly entreated Brother! For us was thy back so bent, for us were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed: thou wert our conscript, on whom the lot fell, and fighting our battles wert so marred. Far on thee too lay a God-created Form, but it was not to be unfolded; incrusted must it stand with the thick adhesions and defacements of Labor: and thy body, like thy soul, was not to know freedom. Yet toil on, toil on: thou art in thy duty, be out of it who may; thou toilest for the altogether indispensable, for daily bread. A second man I honor, and still more highly: Him who is seen

toiling for the spiritually indispensable; not daily bread, but the bread of Life. Is not he too in his duty; endeavoring—toward inward Harmony; revealing this, by act or by word, through all his outward endeavors, be they high or low? Highest of all, when his outward and his inward endeavor are one: when we can name him Artist; not earthly Craftsman only, but inspired Thinker, who with heaven-made implement conquers Heaven for us! If the poor and humble toil that we have Food, must not the high and glorious toil for him in return, that he have Light, have Guidance, Freedom, Immortality?—These two, in all their degrees, I honor; all else is chaff and dust, which let the wind blow whither it listeth —Unspeakably touching is it, however, when I find both dignities united, and he that must toil outwardly for the lowest of man's wants, is also toiling inwardly for the highest—Sublimer in this world know I nothing than a Peasant Saint, could such now anywhere be met with—Such a one will take thee back to Nazareth itself; thou wilt see the splendor of Heaven spring forth from the humblest depths of Earth, like a light shining in great darkness.

STEDMAN'S VIEWS AND VALUATIONS.*

Mr. Stedman's "Introduction" is far from being the least valuable part of the volume which contains his compilation of the choicest and most typical examples of the poetry of the English tongue written by American authors between 1787 and 1899; although the collection itself is judiciously regarded as "the most authoritative, catholic, and sensitive exposition that has been made, or that is likely to be made, of American verse for the period which it covers." As compared with his previous volume, *A Victorian Anthology*, Mr. Stedman thinks that, if that collection of verse from the poets of England exceeds in wealth of choice production, this anthology of the writings of the poets of America may nevertheless prove to be, from an equally vital point of view, the more significant of the two. In amplification of which opinion he says:

Our own poetry excels as a recognizable voice in utterance of the emotions of a people. The storm and stress of youth have been upon us, and the nation has not lacked its lyric cry; meanwhile the typical sentiments of piety, domesticity, freedom have made our less impassioned verse at least sincere. One who underrates the significance of our literature, prose or verse, as both the expression and the stimulant of national feeling, as of import in the past and to the future of America, and therefore of the world, is deficient in that critical insight which can judge even of its own day unwarped by personal taste or deference to public impression. He shuts his eyes to the fact that at times, notably throughout the years resulting in the Civil War, this literature has been a "force." Its verse, until the dominance of prose fiction—that is well into the seventies—formed the staple of

* *An American Anthology*, by Edmund Clarence Stedman. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston. Price, cloth, $3. See Book Notices.

current reading; and fortunate it was—while pirated foreign writings, sold cheaply everywhere, handicapped the evolution of a native prose school—that the books of the elder American poets lay on the center tables of our households and were read with eager zest by old and young. They were not the fosterers of new-world liberty and aspiration solely; beyond this, in the case of Longfellow, for example, the legends read between the lines made his verse as welcome in Great Britain as among his own countryfolk. The criterion of poetry is not its instant vogue with the ill-informed classes; yet when it is the utterance of an ardent people, as in the works of Longfellow, Bryant, Emerson, Lowell, Whittier, it once more assumes its rightful place as the art originative of belief and deed. Emerson presented such a union of spiritual and civic insight with dithyrambic genius as may not be seen again. His thought is now congenital throughout vast reaches, among new peoples scarcely conscious of its derivation. Longfellow and his pupils, for their part, excited for our people the old-world sense of beauty and romance, until they sought for a beauty of their own and developed a new literary manner—touched by that of the motherland, yet with a difference. In Bryant, often pronounced cold and granitic by readers bred to the copious-worded verse of modern times, is found the large imagination that befits a progenitor. It was stirred, as that of no future American can be, by his observation of primeval nature. He saw her virgin mountains, rivers, forests, prairies broadly; and his vocabulary, scant and Doric as it was, proved sufficient for nature's elemental bard. His master may have been Wordsworth, but the difference between the two is that of the prairie and the moor, Ontario and Windermere, the Hudson and the Wye. From "Thanatopsis" in his youth to "The Flood of Years" in his hoary age, Bryant was conscious of the overstress of nature unmodified by human occupation and training. . . . The æsthetic note of poetry was restored by Longfellow, in his Vergilian office, and by Edgar Poe with surer magic and endurance. . . . The polemic work of Whittier, Lowell, and their allies illustrates the applied force of lyrical expression. . . . Poe's renaissance of art for beauty's sake, and Whitman's revolt against social and literary traditions were in full accord with the modern spirit. The academic vantage no less held its own with Parsons and Holmes as maintainers—the former our purest classicist, and a translator equaled only by Bayard Taylor. The stately elegance of Parsons limited his audience, yet perfected the strength of his ode "On a Bust of Dante," than which no finer lyric ennobles this collection. Holmes's grace, humor, contemporaneousness, brought him into favor again and again, and the closing days of a sparkling career were the most zestful for the acknowledged master of new "architects of airy rhyme" on each side of the Atlantic. In Lowell, the many-sided, the best equipped, and withal the most spontaneous of these worthies, their traits were combined. Never was there a singer at once so learned and so unstudied; no other American took the range that lies between the truth and feeling of his dialect verse and the height of his national odes.

Of the poetry produced in the period since the Civil War it is said that, though having less to do with public tendencies and events, it has had "none the less a force of its own; that of the beauty and enlightenment which shape the ground for larger offices hereafter, by devotees possibly no more gifted than their

forbears, yet farther up the altar steps." After referring to the effective lyrics of Poe, to Emerson's translunary spirit, to Longfellow as the people's artist of the beautiful, and to Whittier as a born balladist, Stedman, while not specifying the chief writers of our later period, many of whom are still with us, says:

> As the country has grown, the Eastern song-belt has widened, and other divisions have found voice. The middle West quickly had poets to depict its broad and plenteous security; and more lately very original notes have come from territory bordering upon the Western Lakes. The Pacific coast and the national steppes and ranges as yet scarcely have found adequate utterance, though not without a few open-air minstrels. Dialect and folklore verse represents the new South; its abundant talent has been concerned otherwise with prose romance; yet the song of one woman, in a border State, equals in beauty that of any recent lyrist. Some poets of this period have gone who should have died hereafter. Sill was a sweet and wise diviner, of a type with Clough and Arnold. O'Reilly is zealously remembered, both the poet and the man. In Emma Lazarus a star went out, the western beacon of her oriental race. When Sidney Lanier died, not only the South that bore him, but the country and our English rhythm underwent the loss of a rare being—one who was seeking out the absolute harmony, and whose experiments, incipient though they were, were along the pathways of discovery. Eugene Field's departure lessened our laughter, wit, and tears. In the present year, Hovey, whom the new century seemed just ready to place among its choristers, was forbidden to outlive the completion of the intensely lyrical "Taliesin," his melodious swan-song.

Were Stedman writing now, he might add regret for the much-deplored premature departure of that charming and vigorous writer, a contributor to this Review, Maurice Thompson, the author of that popular book, *Alice of Old Vincennes*, who has stood at the head of poetic celebrants of forest archery, fishing, and other outdoor sports, but whose later work broadened into larger ranges—the gallant Confederate soldier who shows himself as the friend of freedom in "A Creole Slave-song" and "Lincoln's Grave," and as a patriot, a passionate, proud patriot, in that most stirring poem "The Lion's Cub"—a poem not unworthy to be put by this nation, in these days of Anglo-Saxon "expansion" and so-called "imperialism," side by side with Kipling's "The White Man's Burden," the one a message of glorious incitement, the other of grim and solemn admonition.

As for poetry, Mr. Stedman thinks it the last of all the arts to which the word "lost" can be applied. It is sure to be a perennial product of human nature, and no century can claim supereminence as the poetic age. And as for America, with all her brawn and force, so far from having passed a poetic cli-

macteric, she is only entering upon her song. The instinctive sense of beauty is more in evidence among us every year. In other centuries and lands the culmination of imaginative literature has more than once been found in the poetic drama, and as yet, Mr. Stedman says, there has been little of the indubitably dramatic in our rhythmical production, a token that our culmination is before and not behind. This seasoned and sagacious haruspice, whose searching fingers are familiar with the vitals of literature, believes that the height of utterance in Shakespeare's mode and tongue is not in the past, but is still to be attained by us. Looking before and after, the talk of literary atrophy seems childish to him, especially when he remembers what lifeless, unproductive, songless stretches preceded the Miltonic and the Georgian outbursts. He thinks the present pause in high poetic products is innocuous and a safeguard against cloying, a rest in which force is accumulating, and he notes that our new-fledged genius is not listless but is testing its wings in fields outside the poetic hedgerows. His prognosis is that "in the near future the world, and surely its alertest and most aspiring country, will not lack poets." Having brought to these pages, largely in his own words, some of the views and valuations given by Stedman in the Introduction to his *American Anthology*, a more distinct notice of the work itself will seek to present its merits among our Book Notices.

FRENCH PROSPECTS.

Why does a retired sea-captain say: "People going to Europe often ask me which is the best line to take. I tell them to take any line except the French; if there were a Spanish or an Italian line I should also except it"? What means the European maxim, "Do not trust a Frenchman with a ship or a horse;" and why are the grooms and jockeys of Paris, as a rule, not French or Italian, but English or Irish? Does it indicate a lack of resource, a want of nerve and grip and grit in the French character? Ships and horses are among the things which bring men into sudden emergencies where safety depends on alertness, promptitude, coolness, courage, and swift decisive vigor. The question is not unnatural whether men who are not good at managing ships or mastering horses are competent to guide a government, when the elements to be controlled are like wild

horses and surrounding conditions are like the surging sea; and this is one reason why the prospects of the French Republic have been considered dubious and debatable.

Of the families into which the Caucasian race is divided, the Teutonic and the Anglo-Saxon, with their affiliated Celts, have been charged with unduly and unkindly disparaging the Latin nations; but is it possible to find one intelligent person who expects the course of world history to be controlled or largely influenced in the twentieth century by either the Spaniards, the Italians, or the French? And is it not quite impossible to avoid noticing that in this division and emumeration, "Latin nations" is pretty nearly synonymous with Roman Catholic, while, on the other hand, Father Brian J. Clinch, in a recent issue of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, shows that Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon are nearly equivalent to Protestant—less than ten per cent of the Roman Catholics of the world being found in English-speaking lands, while in Germany and Holland also their numbers steadily diminish. That the Romanized Latin nations are not among the strongest and sturdiest is so plain as to be beyond dispute.

Another fact of some importance is that the French Republic is not so well built for stability in its constitution as our own. In its construction it is far from being so perfect a model of free institutions as ours. It is not so well safeguarded from corruption and abuses, gives more scope to the exercise of arbitrary power, and is more liable to be overthrown by some ambitious and unscrupulous *coup d'état* like that of Louis Napoleon. Indeed, France, though nominally republican, is less essentially republican than is monarchical England, and the liberal popular spirit of English government is at this very time notably evidenced by its allowing the establishment of an *imperium in imperio* in the organization of the Australian Federation with a construction modeled largely upon that of the United States.

Thoughtful patriots in France are not without misgivings and apprehensions. In the end of the nineteenth century, two anxious and unhopeful French books invited attention to the plight, and discussed the prospects, of France, *The Cause of Anglo-Saxon Superiority*, by Edward Demolins, and *The Disease of Democracy*, by Gaston Deschamps. These writers describe the present generation of Frenchmen as destitute of reverence, believing nothing, and respecting nothing, treating

gravest problems flippantly, lacking self-control and independence, truthfulness and manliness. Demolins and Deschamps deplore the decadence, physical, mental, and moral, which is manifest in the pitiable incapacity of the average young Frenchman to hold his own in the struggle for life and success, his childish want of enterprise and his persistent looking to "government" to do something for him—a decadence manifest also in a literature base with degraded conceptions of humanity, inflated with insane egotism, sickly with morbid fatalism, bitter with cynicism, and leprous with licentiousness, as well as in a journalism which represents the triumph of scandal and sensation, and in public enterprises mismanaged by incompetence and moth-eaten by jobbery.

One distinct note in the warning appeal of these two honest publicists is the cry for capable leadership which is heard in Deschamps's dedication of his book "to all Frenchmen who suffer in the present and are anxious for the future, to the great minister we cannot find, and the statesman for whom we are waiting"—which recalls the poet's cry, "Ah God, for a man with heart, head, hands, like some of the simple great ones, gone forever and forever by, one still, strong man in a blatant land!" Doubtless one towering man of rugged virtue, dogged incorruptibility, and uncommon sense, if in place and power, might do much for France; yet, in addition to the difficulty of finding such a one, salvation by the virtue and valor of a single man is an idea somewhat mediæval and monarchical. If the Republic is to endure, even such men as Demolins and Deschamps must learn that democracies prosper and are stable, not so much by the overmastering dominance of one superior personality, as by the intelligence, sober-mindedness, honesty, and homely virtues of the multitude—that the power which makes a republic safe is "the common sense of most," holding fretful, fickle, and turbulent elements in awe.

The most serious thing, after all, in the alarm sounded by these writers, is that the real ground for their apprehensions seems to lie somewhere in the French character. They show us a nation so superficial that no amount of sore suffering, in consequence of its own wild excesses and tragic follies, has sufficed to solemnize its mind; a people engaging with boundless *esprit, verve, elan* in plays and pastimes, but deficient in the strength and earnestness demanded by serious affairs. When a people, sur-

rounded by the inciting examples and pushing rivalries of strenuous nations, are content with the rôle of cook, caterer, costumer, and comedian to civilization, applying their creative genius to the invention of fashion plates and operettas and their critical faculties to judging of the flavor of sauces, bouquet of wines, grace of gowns, charms of actresses, and etiquette of the duel, there must be some lack of great and noble qualities. In the light of history, what is the probable forecast of the horoscope of a people whose mirth seems more light-headedness than light-heartedness, whose laughter resembles the crackling of thorns under a pot filled with the "brewed enchantments" of Comus, whose breath reeks of cognac and absinthe, who care less for purity and principle than that life be made vivacious, piquant, and sensational, who do not mind what threatening thunders mutter around Sinai's rocking cliffs provided the boulevards are brilliant and the gardens gay? Mrs. Browning noticed in the life of the Parisians a pervading artificiality, as intimated when she wrote of

> The glittering boulevards, the white colonnades,
> Of fair fantastic Paris, who wears trees
> Like plumes as if man made them, spire and tower
> As if they had grown by nature; tossing up
> Her fountains in the sunshine of the squares:

—a city whose people, with consummately confusing art, transpose the order of realities, giving a theatrical falsity to life by making the artificial seem natural and the natural appear as if it were artificial. One reason why the French praise Poe extravagantly is that he and his characters are artificial like themselves. Clara Morris, herself an actress, thinks that Booth's assassination of Lincoln was inspired partly by the natural vanity of an actor who craves dramatic situations in real life. Among the French a passion for the theatrical often appears, even in their way of transacting the sober and momentous business of life, as if they imagined themselves on the stage and in the glare of the footlights. In their action there is no little acting, and French history, in a degree exceeding any other, has been characterized by comedy culminating frequently in tragedy. Carlyle, searching for the secret of this reign of insincerity and make-believe, of polite perfidy and debonair duplicity, goes back to the sixteenth century and writes: "France, with its keen intellect, saw the truth and was within a hair's breadth of be-

coming Protestant; but France saw fit to massacre Protestantism, and end it at the bidding of the execrable Charles XI, on the night of St. Bartholomew, 1572. The genius of Fact and Veracity accordingly withdrew, was staved off, got kept away for two hundred years."

But whatever be the origin and causes of the faults and frailties which Demolins and Deschamps describe in their fellow-countrymen, there is no denying that a population which shows a want of mental and moral soundness, a population liable to paroxysms of emotional insanity and capable of such a volcanic explosion of popular passion as the French Revolution, furnishes a precarious foundation for a form of government which preeminently depends for its safety on a high average of personal character and wisdom in its citizens.

The task of maintaining a republic in France resembles, not so faintly as we could wish, the problem of making a lighthouse stand firm amid the fury of the waves off Cape Hatteras; and no engineers have yet been able to build one which could withstand the sweep of the surges across the Diamond Shoals. Nevertheless we think a more hopeful feeling is warranted than that which depresses the French writers whose fears have been referred to. To begin with, there is encouragement in the fact that the French Republic has stood for thirty years in spite of the intrigues of royalists, Bonapartists, clericals, and Boulangists, whose triumph would have meant its downfall and the ruin of French liberties. It has been fortunate in the feebleness and mutual jealousies of the various hereditary claimants to the throne. The danger from militarism is far less than in the days of Marshal MacMahon's presidency, and the prestige of the army has been so diminished by the exposures and humiliations of the Dreyfus trial that the supremacy of the civilian is more than ever assured. And that shameful drama of calumny, intrigue, and perjury was not without other benefits, for, as Demolins says, the Dreyfus *affaire*, with its startling revelations of corruption and raising of sharp ethical issues, forced the nation back into moral life, so that, "to the surprise of Europe, France for the first time in fifteen years became serious." Doubtless the Parisian populace is capricious, volatile, frivolous, and Baron von Humboldt wrote truly that "Frivolity undermines all morality and permits no deep thought or pure feeling to germinate; in a frivolous soul nothing can emanate

from principle, and sacrifice and self-conquest are out of the question." But against giddy and passionate Paris there is much steadying ballast in the hard-working and frugal, even though unintelligent, peasantry of the provinces, who mostly paid out of their hard earnings the indemnity exacted by Germany after the Franco-Prussian war. One encouraging fact is that the government is to-day in the hands of the most virile, brainy, and sturdy class, the upper working class, known as the *haute bourgeoisie.* To this class belong President Loubet, and Premier Waldeck-Rousseau and his cabinet, and the members of the legislature, as also the bankers, lawyers, physicians, merchants, and authors, indeed the strong successful men in every department. The control is not likely to be wrenched from their stout muscular grip by feebler hands. It is not encouraging to hear Brunetière condemning the French government for its anti-clericalism, saying, "You cannot be at once anti-Catholic and French;" but Yves Guyot speaks for a fast-growing sentiment when he says that the need of the situation is an open rupture with the Vatican and that France be de-Catholicized. France needs to be less exclusively French, more cosmopolitan in her intelligence, comprehending better the character and ideals of her neighbors. With all their psychological acuteness, the French fail to understand the ethical seriousness of sturdier peoples. A Frenchman called the English "insular," but it is the French who insulate themselves and alienate themselves from neighboring nations, from Germany on the east by bitter animosity, and from Great Britain on the west by suspicion and aversion.

Most of all, France needs that Gospel which was massacred and exiled with the Huguenots, that grace which teaches men that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly, righteously, godly in this present world. She will not work out her salvation until she does more fearing and trembling in the august presence of the moralities and sanctities of existence. Amid much darkness she could find her path to peace and power and permanence by the radiant light of the illumined face of Robert W. McAll, the evangelist of the *Mission Populaire,* who entered France with the Gospel of the Huguenots, though with only so much knowledge of French as enabled him to say to the wretched poor of Paris, "God loves you—I love you!"

THE ARENA.

IS CHRISTIANITY IN A STATE OF DECLINE OR OF TRANSITION?

In a recent issue of the *North American Review* Dr. Briggs seems to have taken the attitude that the apparent decline in Church membership and attendance is due to a revolt from official orthodoxy, and that it not only does not indicate any real decline of faith in the essentials of Christianity but is rather "an evidence that Christianity is in a state of transition . . . from an untenable position of exaggerated dogma to a truer and stronger position." Commenting upon Dr. Briggs's position the *Review* for November, 1900, says: "The charge that this nonattendance upon Christian Churches is a revolt from the preaching of orthodoxy is easily answered by a reference to the fact that there is no manifest tendency to increased attendance on the services of those who are designated as liberal Christians. The Universalist and Unitarian Churches, according to the theory set forth by Dr. Briggs, should be crowded and should grow with great rapidity. But investigation will show that such is not the case. The large congregations and the attendance on general religious services will be found more widely prevalent in the orthodox Churches than elsewhere."

We write not to support the contention of Dr. Briggs, but only to show that it is not so "easily answered." The suggestion that, if there were any such transition as Dr. Briggs describes it would be manifested in the rapid growth of the Universalist and Unitarian Churches assumes that these bodies occupy the "truer and stronger position" toward which it is claimed Christianity is tending. That Dr. Briggs would accept this assumption we very much doubt. A careful analysis of the present tendency of advanced theological thought will show that it is not in the direction of Universalism or Unitarianism; and that it is much too broad to find its goal within the limits of these narrow sects. The dislike for official orthodoxy to which Dr. Briggs refers is a revolt from exaggerated dogma and narrow sectarianism. But the Universalist and Unitarian Churches are as dogmatic and sectarian as any of the orthodox denominations, and much more so than some of them. It is true that Universalists and Unitarians are "designated as liberal Christians." But it is only because they have been bold enough to call themselves such. As a matter of fact they are less liberal than the liberal wing of the orthodox Churches. Hence, if it is true that the tendency toward liberal Christianity is the cause of the decline of attendance upon orthodox Churches, it does not necessarily follow that the Universalist and Unitarian Churches would show a corresponding gain in their congregations and membership; for those who are led to revolt

from the preaching of orthodoxy may not only remain Christians but evangelicals, as well.

There is a growing feeling in our day that evangelical Christianity does not depend for its life upon the literal truthfulness or infallibility of the orthodox creeds; and there is a manifest tendency in orthodox Churches either to revise the creeds or to hold them less dogmatically. If Dr. Briggs has not overestimated the magnitude of the revolt from orthodoxy and the influence which such a revolt is exerting in the "transformation of the dogmas of the Church," the result of the transition to which he refers will be the revision of the orthodox creeds as they now exist in the thought and teaching of the Church, rather than the triumph of Universalism and Unitarianism over evangelical Christianity.

It can hardly be hoped that Christianity will outlive the Church. But the power of the Church to adapt itself to changed conditions and to keep abreast with the progress of human knowledge is proved by history. The ideal of Christendom is not "absence of Church attendance" or a Churchless Christianity, but is rather a Church united in spirit, broad and liberal enough in form to include all Christians within its fold, and progressive enough to expand with man's ever-widening view of divine revelation. The evangelical idea which recognizes the various denominations as branches of the one Church comes nearest to this ideal.

E. F. Roe.

Lacon, Ill.

"THE RELIGION OF CHILDHOOD."

A remarkable article upon the above subject, from the pen of Dr. J. A. Story, is found in the *Review* for July, 1900. Doctors Mercein, Hibbard, and Nadal were all sweet-spirited, lovable men whose natural instincts would have led them to repudiate the doctrine of future punishment, or of sin in any form, or of retribution of any character; yet it is to be doubted whether any one of them could have gotten the consent of his mind to write such an article. The writer of this criticism upon that article is not well up in Boston theology nor well acquainted with the intricacies of the higher criticism, but he must believe in plain Scripture. Somehow he has been unfortunately (?) led by the Bible to believe that "the carnal mind is enmity against God;" that even the heart of a child is "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked;" that all are "by nature the children of wrath;" that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;" that David supposed he had been "shapen in iniquity;" that Paul found a law in his members "warring against the law" of his mind; and that Jesus regarded it as necessary that even such a good man as Nicodemus must experience a new birth.

All these things have led me and multitudes of other Bible students

to believe that at some time and in some way every child of Adam needs to have a change of heart; that there must come a "vanishing point" when culture or something else must make the child of nature the child of grace. It is somewhat severe on the past to say, with Dr. Story, that "the intelligent kindergartner of to-day who is an earnest Christian comes nearer to finding the natural laws of the Christian life for childhood than all the Sunday preaching and teaching of our fathers." That smacks of a new theology and seems to us to reflect upon the knowledge and wisdom of Fletcher, Wesley, Ames, Simpson, and others of the fathers who did not hold that a child of Christian parents was born *ex necessitate* with a tendency to the good and only needed guiding, fostering, and developing into full salvation. Is this new doctrine better than the old ?

Nor is it true that every child is "won more by love of good than by hatred of evil." Some may be, but many are not. The sense of danger, even in a child, is often appealed to by the best of parents with good effect. "By our theology and by our insistence upon this idea of conversion we often forbid the children to come unto Christ." This is because we have not yet discovered "what we may call natural laws for the spiritual growth of a child." Probably some Drummond or some other kindergartner may yet discover these laws. Dr. Story may have been misunderstood, but the trend of his article is against the fact that we inherited from sinful Adam a tendency to sin, and that at some point the blood of Jesus must cleanse the child from this inherited tendency. That it may be a gradual and almost imperceptible cleansing is freely granted, for even adults are converted without being able to tell when the great change came. But there is, we greatly fear, a growing tendency in these latter days to exalt culture above repentance and conversion—which disposition is to be deprecated—and the article under review goes a great way in that direction. At least so it seems to one careful reader of the *Methodist Review*.

While the old method of preaching has not done all that has been desired, and while revivals have seemed to be necessary, it may be well not to let our sympathies get the better of our judgment. Samuel was a little slow to understand the Lord's call, and but few have such a call. If the "religion of childhood" can be kept in the heart the world may not be entirely "redeemed," but it will be greatly helped. With all of the beautiful things in the article under review this writer is in full accord, and with many of the conclusions reached there is complete agreement; but against the seeming teaching of natural childhood purity without added grace a protest is uttered. Revivals are good and conversion is necessary for every descendant of Adam; parental example and teaching, moral culture and discipline in right conduct are all indispensable; but the line of the new birth must be crossed by every child before he can become the child of God.

Los Angeles, Cal. W. R. Goodwin.

ATHEISM NO DISPROOF OF IMMORTALITY.

In the "Arena" for January S. R. Reno suggests two valuable arguments for immortality, considered from the scientific standpoint. Another argument may also be offered, which should be taken in connection with the ninth point for immortality in the paper on "Science and Immortality," in the *Review* for September, 1900, such point being that "the existence of a First Cause presupposes immortality in man." In connection with this it may be said that the denial of a First Cause is an acknowledgment of human immortality. If the existence of a First Cause be denied; if all creative acts as beginnings be denied; and if it should be affirmed that the world is eternal, having passed successively through vast cycles of development and change from apparent chaos to orderly forms—which cycles ever recur, like the oscillation of a swinging pendulum, from everlasting to everlasting—even then, man, the simple spiritual element, has existed from the most distant eternity, just as has the gold or the simple chemical element, and like the gold is destined to exist forever. That this is true, we think, is incontrovertible, or at least cannot be successfully denied.

If the soul has existed forever as an element in the world scheme and has not lost its identity in all past eternity, with its many changes of relation, from the time of the whirling fire mist to the era of the perfect physical man, it certainly is not inconceivable that man should continue to exist after death in new and even unsuspected relations to the universe. Moreover, even if, after all, there prove to be no God or First Cause, still all the facts of human life—physical, mental, and moral—all the facts of human obligation, of virtue, and of vice, together with their recompenses, remain wholly unchanged. If a First Cause exists, but should be destroyed, many of these facts would be lost in that destruction; but, if there actually be no First Cause, all these facts exist and continue to exist irrespective of our speculations upon the subject. And who shall deny that these facts, grounded as they assuredly are in human consciousness, are consistent with the eternal world scheme which is sweeping on to the consummation of another splendid cycle in cosmic history—a cycle so vast as to be beyond the calculation of our mathematics and beyond imagination.

Wisdom, whose excellent impress is stamped in all the forms and features of the world around us, forbids that man, her noblest work, shall prove a sad misfit at last, stamping wisdom with the name of folly. Power, which is everywhere exhibited in the kingdoms of this world, forbids that man who sways omnipotence should, after all, prove the weakest of the weak. And love, whose tender sympathies are so woven into all the fabric of earthly life, forbids that man shall utterly perish from existence and in death be robbed of all future activity and joys of which love has dreamed.

G. H. Bennett.

Woodburn, Ore.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY FOR THE MINISTRY.

It is everywhere conceded that the close of the nineteenth century finds the world in a period of transition than which none in the past has been more remarkable. National problems of a new and varied character are thrust upon us. Social questions are at the front, in the thought of large masses of people. And religious problems are none the less in evidence—indeed, they are perhaps the greatest. For, with all the apparent unrest in the world, religion has never received more attention than now—the attitude of some being hostile, that of others being indifferent, and that of still others being one of profound interest and favor.

But, if great problems affect the people generally, they none the less affect the minister, and how far the new conditions demand new methods is a question which thoughtful Christians will do well to consider. The first problem which the Church confronts is that of numbers. Is the growth of Christianity to be measured by the increase of membership in the churches? There is a feeling widely prevalent that it is not essential to be a Church member in order to be a Christian, in fact, that men can be as good Christians outside the Church, and even better, than within its pale. This is so manifest a departure from the general theory of Christianity in the past that it needs attention on the part of the minister of the new century. Shall it be understood that only those are Christians who are on the rolls of the Church and punctually attend the house of God? Or, shall we accept the theory that Christianity is broader and includes all who are seeking a better life, whether within the Church or out of it?

With this is closely connected the feeling, widely prevalent, that the conditions of Church membership should be modified, and that less should be demanded in the way of obligation on the part of the applicant for the privileges of the Church. It is well known that the Presbyterians make a distinction between the vows of a minister and those of a layman. They do not require a formal assent to the "Confession of Faith" on the part of the members of the Church, but it is required of those who are to be public teachers. A desire for a shorter and a simpler creed, which is being expressed and now discussed in that body, is but the expression of a wish to make the way into the ministry as simple as the way into Church membership. There seems to be reason for this, as one can hardly think that such a broad distinction should be made between the faith of the preacher and that of the people; and yet there is a widespread feeling on this matter. The thought is that the organization of the Church in its forms of thought is too complex, and

that there should be a return to what is characterized as "the simplicity of the early Church" in this matter. The problem, therefore, of Church membership is one that the minister must soon confront.

Another of the problems is that of Christian unity. The prayer of the Lord that his disciples might all be one is being largely approved in the thought of Christendom. There is scarcely a minister of any Christian Church who would not hail the day when there should be such a union of the forces of Christendom as would enable the Church to give its undivided strength to its work of saving men. It is believed that too much effort is expended in promoting the peculiar interests of the several denominations. There is such a tendency to build up individual denominations, rather than the Christian life, that men are asking whether there is not some ground on which all may unite, so as to cause the divergences of Protestant Christendom practically to disappear. The question with many to-day is not whether it ought to be done, but how shall it be realized. Each one is willing to give up something, but that something is always something indifferent and not fundamental. When the Episcopalian can see his way clear to modify his claims for an historic episcopacy, and the Baptist the necessity of immersion as essential to entrance into the visible Church, and the Methodist his peculiar form of Church organization—in short, when each one shall be willing to make concessions, that there may be a common effort to save men—the time of Christian unity will have come. But, as yet, the question is one that must be confronted.

A third problem that must be considered is that of the relation of the Church to the social movements of the world. The social question has come to stay. The Church has thus far largely kept aloof from it, but it can no longer do so. The relation of the classes and the masses, so called, is one that will not down, and how to meet the emergencies of the time and lead capital to perform its duties and labor to meet its proper obligations, without the loss of self-respect on the part of either, must be considered. The remedy for social discontent must be wrought out in the thought and life of the people, and especially under the wise teaching and humane influence of a godly ministry.

Another practical problem which the beginning of the new century will confront is that of methods of Christian work. Is the development of the Church to be educational or revivalistic? The method of our fathers is largely that of expecting a sudden turn in the life of the individual, called "conversion;" that is, entrance into the Church is a break and a revolution in the life. Having preached the Gospel to the people, at length, through the power of the Holy Spirit, an impression is made on the human soul; there is a turning away from sin and a turning to God; there is a conscious awakening of the new life, the assurance of the divine favor, and the man becomes a new man in Christ Jesus. When this takes place, about the same time, with a multitude of people who are brought into the Church, it is called a revival of religion.

There is a tendency, however, to train people up into Christianity; to prevent them, if possible, from going the wrong way in the start; to bring them into the Church as seekers of religion, even before conversion. Of course, this includes the operation of the Holy Spirit on the human heart and the conscious self-surrender of the soul to God through Christ. Is there not a tendency to dismiss the old forms? And in the new century will not the process of Church work be largely one of training on the part of parents and of churches in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?

A still further problem which we confront is that of form and ritual. One can scarcely be blind to the fact that the tendencies in this respect, at the close of the nineteenth century, are decidedly ritualistic. Educated people, who are called cultured, are growing to a love of decorous services, and are unwilling to admit anything that is out of harmony with correct taste. They are desirous that the service from beginning to end shall be conducted with precision and beauty; in other words, the worship of Christendom is growing to be more æsthetic. Formerly, the Presbyterian Church was probably the most simple; now, in many respects, their service tends gradually toward that of the Episcopal. The Methodist Episcopal Church has ever recognized something of form in its worship, but the growth of the sentiment is manifest in the action of the more recent General Conferences and in the increasing practice of the churches.

To meet these problems our young ministers should arouse themselves. The new century should open with new consecration on the part of every preacher of the Gospel, especially so with those who this year take upon themselves the vows of this high office. Consecration is itself an element in solving such subjects. A consecrated heart almost instinctively accepts the line of duty; but joined with religious consecration should come a profound study of the conditions of the world at the present time—material, social, political, religious. Never were broad information, profound insight, and deep religious conviction more needed than to-day, and we may well pray that this may be the heritage with which our rising ministry shall begin the new century.

THE HOMILETICAL VALUE OF THE LATE REVISION OF THE SCRIPTURES.—Rom. i, 14, 15.

One instance of the homiletic value of the changes in the Revision of 1881 is found in the insertion or omission of the article. A passage in illustration of this point is found in Rom. i, 14, 15. The King James version reads: "I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also." The Revision of 1881 translates the same passage thus: "I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish. So, as much as in me

is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you also that are in Rome." The significant change, as found in this new translation, is the absence of the article before the words "Greeks" and "Barbarians," the fullness of meaning being greatly enlarged by the change.

We may inquire why the revisers omitted the article where the King James version inserted it, since this is not a case of textual variation—the manuscripts in neither case employing the article, while in the King James version it is inserted. In answer, it may be due to the fact that the meaning and importance of the article does not seem to have been in the mind of the early revisers, as it was with the more recent revisers; in fact, the emphasis put by the scholarship of later years on the article has in many cases greatly modified the meaning. It has been well suggested by Winer that, "in the language of living intercourse it is utterly impossible that the article should be omitted where it is absolutely necessary, or inserted where it is not required." He allows, however, that "there are cases in which the article may be either inserted or omitted with equal objective correctness;" and, while the laws governing the use and omission of the article are yet in some confusion, the general principle as laid down by Winer prevails. Applying this principle to the text, the following is a general analysis of the passage: It affirms, first, Paul's recognition of obligation—"I am debtor;" second, to whom he was obligated; third, his readiness to fulfill his obligation; and, fourth, the nature of the obligation, namely, to preach the Gospel.

The homiletic value of the omission of the article will appear under the second point, namely, that Paul states his obligation both to Greeks and to Barbarians. That is, he does not say "to the Greeks," but "to Greeks," the grammatical point involved being that the absence of the article indicates that the noun with which it is connected is viewed in its qualitative, rather than its individual aspect. The article as inserted in the ordinary version indicates that Paul regards his obligation to be "to the Greeks." In general usage the term "Greek" meant such as were residents of Greece, or of the colonies of Greece, that is, the people who had proceeded from the centers of Greek culture and who spoke the Greek tongue; this would include the cities like Corinth and Ephesus, and wherever the Greek language prevailed. The same remark would apply to the term "Barbarians." In Greek thought all those who were not Greeks were called by this term, however cultured they might be. The word "Barbarian" merely meant one who spoke a language not Greek. In this sense the cultured men among the Jews and Asiatic races generally would be so designated. It was not necessarily a term of reproach, except as it grew out of the application of the term.

The omission of the article at once broadens and expands the meaning. "I am debtor to Greeks;" that is, to such as are Greeks; to all who bear the marks of Greek thought and understand the Greek philosophy and life—wherever the Greek spirit prevails—there Paul regards himself as called upon to preach the Gospel. The question has been

raised whether Paul in this chapter referred to the Romans as "Greeks" or "Barbarians." If we assume that the latter word had a tinge of offensiveness, as perhaps it had at that time in the view of the Greek, the apostle's native courtesy which was exhibited on so many occasions would lead him to regard the Romans under the general application "Greeks," namely, such as are Greeks. Moreover, the Roman civilization in its choicest forms was Greek. Rome was filled with Greek art and had been permeated with Greek literature, and it would be perfectly natural that Paul should regard their civilization as belonging to that high civilization of which the Greeks were then the chief exponents in the world. It is somewhat strange that although there is no article before the words "wise" and "foolish," in the fourteenth verse, the revisers have inserted the article. The omission would have been equally significant if the text had read literally "to wise" and "to unwise"—that is, to the educated and to the uneducated classes; in other words, the meaning would be, "to all such as are wise" and "to all such as are unwise." "The wise" might have been understood as some well-known wise persons, "the unwise" as some well-known unwise persons; but the omission of the article would change the meaning so that it would be "to all such as are wise" and "to all such as are unwise," that is, "to the cultivated" and "to the uncultivated" classes.

The text, then, contains an enlargement of the view as compared with the ordinary version. The preacher finds here a ground for a broad statement, namely, that the apostle with his great mission to proclaim the Gospel regarded himself as called to preach to all nations and races represented by the phrase "to Greeks and to Barbarians"—to all conditions of men, whether cultivated or uncultivated, represented by the words "wise" and "unwise." He not only refers to specific cases or specific nations, but to all nations; there is thus expressed a grand inclusiveness of the world-wideness of the salvation provided by Christ, for Paul affirms that he was debtor to preach the Gospel to them all. It is not uncommon for people to feel, if not to say, that the Gospel is needed by persons who lack culture, refinement, or learning, but that the educated can get along without it. But the passage quoted, as found in the late revision, sweeps away all such thoughts. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is to be preached to all people, whatever their nationality, culture, or business; in other words, this utterance to the Romans is another form of expressing the world-wideness of the Saviour's last command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." The declaration of Paul has been a great missionary text through the centuries, expressed as it is by the greatest of the apostles in a letter of wonderful elaborateness and addressed to the capital of the whole civilized world. The absence of the article in this case, therefore, is rich in homiletical value, and gives fullness to a very important passage of the Scriptures.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

HIGHER CRITICISM AND KINDRED THINGS.

SIGNIFICANT is the language of the editor of one of the leading English religious weeklies, who says: "We cannot persuade ourselves that things are going well with us and our country. [England, but applicable, in a measure, to the United States.] Abroad there is still bloodshed on earth and bitter rancor among the nations. At home we recognize a slackening of moral fervor, a decay of ideals, a dreary dearth of prophets and captains, while the weight of evil against which we have to contend increases, like the letting down of water. Although our people never appeared more prosperous, they never showed plainer and uglier symptoms of the maladies which are bred out of material prosperity. Among the dazzling conquests of science, we begin to question whether man's discoveries of the powers of nature are really giving him increased power over nature. . . . The familiar optimistic watchwords about human progress have somehow lost their spell. Indeed, to be quite candid, this belief that mankind must needs go on steadily advancing from age to age is a modern superstition which, like some other humanitarian dogmas, is derived from the school of Rousseau." The above citation, though not as optimistic as could be desired, is yet a fair presentation of conditions as they now exist in Church and State.

But what has all this to do with higher criticism? Every effect has a cause. If there be, as hinted above, a dearth of religious fervor, a lack of faith, and a decay of morals, has higher criticism, directly or indirectly, contributed to such results? Before such a question can be answered another one must be propounded, namely, What is higher criticism? To one class it is a system, devised by the enemies of revealed religion for the purpose of desupernaturalizing the Holy Scriptures, to eliminate the miraculous and prophetical elements; to another class it is the great panacea which is to heal all our backslidings, to bring back the careless and skeptical to a more rational belief in the essentials of Christianity. The watchword of this latter class is: "Life, not dogma; doing good and being good. Creeds and confessions are no longer vital. Doing the will of God, not believing the Scriptures nor the Christ, is the foundation upon which the Church of the future must be founded." In other words, our beliefs in regard to the Bible and the nature of Christ are minor questions. We are constantly assured that the Bible is only one of the great literatures of the world—literature, to be sure, surpassing in many ways the sacred literatures of all other nations, but, excellent as it is, yet full of errors, and therefore having little or no claim to a supernatural origin. The advanced higher critic does not hesitate to brand much of the Old Testament not only as myth

and legend, but as downright cunningly devised fables, the inventions of crafty priests and wily politicians in the ancient Jewish Church. And why not, they ask, for is this not true of all sacred literatures? We are told that the Bible is a book like any other religious book, and must be treated like any other book. This assumption has taken a deep hold upon modern biblical criticism. Sanday argues that we should let the Bible tell its own story, adding, "Let us by all means study it, if we will, like any other book, but do not let us beg the question that it must be wholly like any other book, that there is nothing in it distinctive and unique." If the Bible is no more inspired than the Vedas, Zend-Avestas, the Koran, and other sacred books, it is passing strange that it has exerted so much more spiritual, energizing, life-giving power than all these put together. Somehow, as no other book, it lifts the individual and the nation to God. The Bible knows no national or geographical boundaries, but addresses "every class with a voice which grows intelligible as each listener is prepared to hear," and wherever it is believed it is the power of God unto salvation.

But to revert to the subject—higher criticism, when properly defined and directed, should have no terror for the most conservative Methodist, notwithstanding that, in its name, some very silly and wicked things have been said and done. Higher criticism, when applied to the Holy Scriptures, is preeminently the science which concerns itself with the origin, date, place, and method of composition of the several books in our canonical Scriptures, and accounting as far as possible for the influences at work when these were written. Now, if this be a fair definition, where is the man who will object to such a science? If, however, higher criticism, in its zeal for new light, branches off into speculation and paradoxes, into vague and irreverent hypothesis, and discusses biblical questions in an unscientific manner, we have a right to question such proceedings, no matter how persistently such men may call themselves higher critics.

Very few intelligent Christians who have studied the subject will seriously object to the assertion that Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes or Canticles, or that some Psalms commonly ascribed to David are not the products of his muse; nor, indeed, will any insist upon the Mosaic origin of every line or section of the Pentateuch, much less will any claim the absolute inerrancy of the entire book. Textual corruptions have undoubtedly crept in as the ages have rolled on. But when learned men, in the name of higher criticism, tell us, with the authority of literary prophets, that Solomon never wrote a line, that the entire Psalter does not possess a verse from the pen of David, that Moses had nothing to do with the Pentateuch, and that not even the Ten Commandments were known to him, but were produced six or seven hundred years after his time, it is time, apparently, to stop and consider. When these same critics assure us that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and even Joshua are unhistorical, have we no right to dissent? Cheyne, discussing the story

of Abraham, says: "The narratives of Abraham have a claim upon our attention. The religious value is for all; the historical or quasi-historical for students only. Hebrew legend may have told of an ancient hero (in the Greek sense of the word) bearing this name. . . . This supposed hero (whose real existence is as doubtful as that of other heroes) cannot originally have been grouped with Jacob or Israel." This is not an extreme instance of this species of criticism, as anyone may convince himself by reading articles in the first volume of *Encyclopædia Biblica*. When, to repeat, we are told that Abraham is no more or less historical than Castor or Pollux; that the story of Israel in Egypt and the wilderness belongs to the realms of fiction; that the Decalogue was not given on Sinai; that the tabernacle with its costly furnishings and elaborate services existed only in the brain of a novel writer; that the bulk of Old Testament miracles never took place; and that it does not contain Messianic prophecies in the proper sense of the word, it is no wonder that a few "uncritical" Methodists ask whether higher critics of this school are dealing out science or fiction!

It would be utterly unfair to say that all those who call themselves higher critics, even though they have accepted the leading conclusions of Graf, Wellhausen, Cheyne, and others, are agnostics or rationalists; indeed, many, if not most, Old Testament critics, in Germany especially, have accepted the literary results of the Wellhausen school, and yet in some mysterious way manage to "reject the religious and historical superstructure erected on this literary theory." It is also equally fair to say that such teachings have reached their summit in Germany, and that the tendency now, not only in the churches, but also in the theological faculties of the universities, is toward more conservative views. The extreme ideas preached by many of the higher critics have, as a rule, paralyzed spiritual growth and retarded the revival of religion. Wherever such views have obtained a firm foothold not only conversions have ceased to be numerous, but even church attendance has greatly fallen off, reverence for the Bible as the inspired word of God manifestly decreased, and the belief in prayer has been weakened; in fact, the prayer meeting itself has been either entirely discontinued or changed into a semi-social gathering. The cardinal doctrines of Christianity, as held by those who have been famous as evangelists and soul winners, are no longer favorite themes for sermons. Sin, as an awful crime against God and something deserving punishment, is rarely dwelt upon. Calvary has been relegated to the background. The merits of the atoning blood of Jesus Christ are not dwelt upon by the disciples of Wellhausen. Repentance for sin and the necessity for the new birth, spoken of by our Lord to Nicodemus, have little place in the theology of the critical school. Instead of the glorious doctrines which gave, not only to giants like Foster and Simpson, but also to thousands of Methodist ministers less able but equally faithful to Jesus Christ and the word of his truth, such tremendous power in turning men to the Lord, we have

now too much of an emasculated theology, which presents Christ as the typical man, the great exemplar, in whose footsteps we must follow. There is an awful indifference to what were regarded by the fathers as some of the most important doctrines of Christianity. Among the causes of this state of things the extreme higher criticism is named.

It is, however, true, as already said, that the historical critics cannot be held responsible for all these ills that threaten Zion. In these latter days a semi-infidel philosophy, taking its cue from naturalistic evolution, has had great fascination for many young men. Unfortunately for biblical criticism, the chief destructive critics of the age "have been adherents of an atheistic evolution of all things." The following words by Professor F. H. Foster, who deplores present conditions, are to the point and state the case well: "The whole drift of the popular evolutionary philosophy of things is toward a view of sin that is merely negative. Sin becomes an incident of the evolutionary process, the necessary condition, it may be, of progress, but something essentially the product of environment, and falling under the category of the undesirable, or the imperfect, or the defective, or the preparatory, and not of the perverse, the guilty, and the ill-deserving. It does not belong to the realm of the voluntary, as the object of repentance, the occasion of self-condemnation, the source of primitive ill. It is no rupture of the designed moral order, but it is as inevitable and essential to the scheme of things as the struggle for existence itself. It is to be avoided by the intelligent as other mistakes are to be avoided." This language may seem strong, but it is more of a portrayal than caricature. This semimaterialism, together with a subconscious Unitarianism, frequently crops out where least expected. Dr. Edward Everett Hale said at a recent conference of his Church, that the chief increase of Unitarianism is not among those who openly profess it, but rather inside the ranks of the so-called evangelical denominations, where, according to him, Unitarianism is often ably proclaimed from Presbyterian and other orthodox pulpits. Indeed, our Roman Catholic friends have some grounds for openly accusing the Protestant Church of increasing doctrinal laxity, especially of loosening its hold upon the doctrine of the Trinity. They go so far as to accuse us of a drifting toward the Socinian and Arian views, claiming that while many are willing to call Jesus Christ divine they no longer worship him any more as the eternal and infinite God, the almighty Creator of heaven and earth. In short, they see a growing tendency to deny the literal incarnation. The worst thing about this fearful charge is that they are able to furnish the names of more than one prominent person willing to plead guilty to the indictment. As already pointed out in these pages, he who disbelieves the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament has taken a long step toward denying the deity of Jesus Christ. The kind of teaching concerning the Holy Scriptures and the nature of Jesus Christ, our Lord, which produces the conditions above described should not be welcomed by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

MISSIONARY REVIEW.

THE EARLY SUCCESS OF CHRISTIANITY IN JAPAN.

THE newspaper of Japan entitled *Chu-o Koron* has addressed itself to the task of accounting for the rise and progress of Christianity in Japan in modern times. It does it as a thing to be accounted for, and this is well. The Romans had some difficulty in explaining the rise of the Christian Church in that empire, though they missed the mark in accounting it as a secret mystical society. There is, however, some force in more than one of the points made by the Japanese editor, and altogether his treatment is respectful, even though it were designed to show that Christianity can be accounted for without reference to anything supernatural in its system or to any other recognized merit in its ethics or doctrines.

There are ten reasons given by this newspaper for the success of Christianity in Japan. The first, that it had the advantage of being introduced at the time of the breaking up of the old feudal order, has pertinency. When all the crusts of society are upturned it is easier than usual for any new system of thinking, secular or sacred, to enter as a part into the new order of things. But the insinuation that the distress of the times led the poor to accept Christianity from selfish motives can scarcely be borne out in such a way as to give it weight. A good deal of pecuniary help was given to those in distress, to be sure, just as Christians have always rendered aid to stricken communities; but the Japanese converts were among well-to-do and educated people in good proportion. The claim, therefore, that the missions were backed by full treasuries, which is the second reason given has altogether less force in Japan than in any other mission field. That "Christianity was enshrouded in the halo of Western civilization"—the third reason named—had nothing derogatory in it, for Christianity had created that halo, and could not go anywhere without being so robed. The fourth reason is like the first, that the new era in education favored acceptance of new ideas, and that Christianity was on hand to do the educating. True, it was a powerful factor, but it could not have done the educating unless capacitated to teach. The fifth reason assigned is that the missionaries took the lead in female education. With that we have no quarrel. It must needs be a powerful factor, from any point of view. Nor have we need to comment on the sixth point, that in all departments of education Japanese weakness "gave the missionaries the opportunities which they promptly made use of." When, seventhly, the editor attributes the success of Christianity to its "advocacy of popular rights," and the association of those rights with Christianity, it might as well say the sun is a success because it gives light, or that

Christianity has succeeded because it is what it is. The eighth reason, that young men and women have been attracted by the novelty of the religious meetings introduced by foreigners, may stand for its worth. The ninth reason is that evangelists and pastors were raised socially by their connection with the Church. While this is a natural sequence in many instances, yet in Japan it has not been true in the majority of instances. The tenth reason reads, "The foreign policy of the government was such that Western institutions, laws, and methods were held in high esteem, and among them Christianity had its share of public favor." But "Western institutions, laws, and methods" are positively inseparable from Christianity, so far as there is anything in them worthy the esteem of the Japanese. The latter have tried in vain to take the one and leave the other.

DUTCH MISSIONS AMONG THE BOERS.

Information concerning the missions of the Hollanders in South Africa, other than that which comes through English channels, is so limited that it is well to give special emphasis to an utterance from some of the principal members of the Synodical Mission Board and the professors of the Theological Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa. This Church is one in creed, language, membership, and blood-relationship with the burghers of the Free State and Transvaal republics. Reviewing the events which led up to the British-Boer war, they declare—what is clear to a great many minds—that this conflict was preventable. Defending the Dutch in South Africa through a series of years, the paper undertakes to refute the charge that the Boers have been intensely hostile to the missionary and the Gospel he preaches. It declares that full liberty to minister to the heathen is granted in both the Free State and the Transvaal. The Berlin and Hermansburg missionary societies have been doing effective missionary work in these republics, and, since 1875, the Berlin society has been intrusted to two synods, each with a superintendent to advise and assist in the various departments. Their stations number fifty-five, half of them in the Transvaal, while the Cape Colony branch of the Dutch Reformed Church maintains several missionary stations and out-stations with honored and respected missionaries in the Transvaal. In one instance an able and earnest minister is wholly supported among Transvaal Boers as a missionary to the heathen. Among the Natal Dutch the same missionary spirit prevails. Not long since they started a Natal-Boer mission for the evangelization of the blacks, which has resulted in a strong Christian congregation of Kaffirs. In the Orange Free State mission work has been organized, with native evangelists as laborers among the blacks under ordained missionaries or pastors of Boer congregations, in almost every village or township, and it has lately been pushed into Central Africa, where the Dutch are supporting two missionaries. In the Transvaal there

are special centers of missionary activity in which the Boers cordially cooperate with their pastors to make the work a success.

The Dutch Reformed Church itself shows as keen an interest and hearty an effort in mission work as any other in South Africa. It contributed last year for this purpose $50,725, though it has a communicant membership of less than 100,000. Its missionary giving is thus at the rate of more than fifty cents a communicant, or about twenty cents *per capita*—a condition of things which is certainly in advance of that of Germany in 1880, when Professor Christlieb said, "The national Church contributed in some places per head at something considerably less than one farthing." This Dutch Church supports throughout South Africa sixty missionaries, with an equal number of evangelists and lay helpers, exclusive of the work done in the Transvaal, Free State, and Natal, and also exclusive of the local contributions to mission work through the several churches which maintain their own missions from their own congregational collections, there being instances where more than $500 is set apart annually in this way to support mission congregations. The Cape Colony Dutch Reformed Church has a foreign and a home mission committee. The foreign field lies in the Transvaal, in Mashonaland, Bechuanaland, the lake country of Central Africa, with some thirty-five missionaries and lay assistants and a number of native evangelists, and the work is gradually extending. The home mission includes all that is done among the Dutch-speaking natives in Cape Colony. Thirty-five of these congregations have been formed into a mission Church, having its own synod and presbyteries, and administering its own affairs subject to the control of the home-mission committee. Other unaffiliated congregations are doing good work, and yearly the Church enlarges its borders.

Within the two republics and Natal the Church has undertaken mission work, and, though its operations have been limited, the missionary spirit and enthusiasm are not lacking. There is also within the Dutch Reformed Church in Cape Colony a Woman's Mission Band which was started in 1889 to support lay teachers and native evangelists. They have also a Theological Students' Missionary Society, while the Young Men's Christian Association has a mission branch which supports a missionary, and the Christian Endeavor societies are actively engaged in work in the Transvaal. Besides this, there is also a Christian Students' Mission, with its branches of missionary volunteers, through which more than one department of the work in this foreign field has been strengthened.

While American and British missionaries have had encouraging success in South Africa, as in the cases of the American Board in Natal and the Wesleyan Missionary Society in the Transvaal, there should be frank and sympathetic recognition of what the Dutch societies of the continent of Europe and of South Africa have effected, and far greater information should be available than at present generally obtains as to their distinctly missionary enterprise.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

Carl Grüneisen. No man can early in life distinguish himself in many lines. Grüneisen has, however, made a good start in a recently published work, entitled *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israels* (Halle a. S., M. Neimeyer, 1900). The book is a serious attempt to overthrow the position of Stade and Schwally relative to ancestor worship in Israel and to demonstrate that, however similar the primitive conceptions of ancient Israel may have been to those of other peoples in a like stage of development, animistic ideas and usages never amounted among the Israelites to a religious reverence and much less constituted the primitive religion of Israel. Grüneisen admits that the animistic view prevailed in ancient Israel, but denies that there is anything in the early Hebrew conception of the soul or the condition of the soul after death to warrant the conclusion that the Israelites ever observed the worship of the dead. After a careful examination of the mourning customs, the alleged offerings to the dead and the conjuring of the dead, he reaches the conclusion that the mourning customs signified no worship of the dead, and that, according to the ideas of ancient Israel, the dead did not live as divine beings to whom reverence was to be offered, in order to make them favorable to the offerers, but as ghostly shades who haunted the earth and against whom men strove to protect themselves as best they could—especially by rendering themselves unrecognizable through fasting and other means. Grüneisen also admits, on the basis of Deut. xxvi, 14; Tobit iv, 17; and Ecclus. vii, 32 *f.*, that the Israelites did place food at the disposal of the dead, though he sees no reason for thinking that the food thus offered was a sacrifice in the same sense in which sacrifices were offered Jahweh. Schwally's view, that in the old Israelitish family the parents as such were reverenced as divine, he disputes. On the other hand he finds that from the earliest times Jahweh was worshiped in the homes of Israel. As an evidence of the thoroughness and completeness of Grüneisen's investigations it is worth while to remember that he takes up also the attempt to trace the origin of family life in Israel to ancestor worship, as with the Greeks and Romans. He finds the parallels between the family constitution of the Græco-Romans and the Israelites outweighed by the differences, and also that so far as those parallels exist they do not originate in a domestic ancestral worship. In fact, he claims that the civilization of Israel prior to the prophetic period did not furnish the conditions requisite to the development of ancestor worship such as existed among the Greeks, Romans, Chinese, and Japanese. Grüneisen would scarcely be called a conservative in America; but all the more valuable are the opinions he

holds relative to this extreme theory that the primitive religion of the Israelites was the worship of the dead in general and of ancestors in particular.

Martin Rade. Through his connection with the *Christliche Welt*, as editor and publisher, Rade wields a wide and powerful influence in the more intelligently religious circles of Germany, and even in other countries—an influence which is all the more important because it is exercised chiefly upon the laity, whence in the end all great religious movements must spring and upon whom all great religious reforms must depend. Hence it is most interesting to know some of the views of this popularizer of the critical theology to which he adheres. We take as a fair specimen some of his recent utterances on the truth of the Christian religion (*Die Wahrheit der christlichen Religion*, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1900). He distinguishes between truth, in the sense in which natural science employs the word, and spiritual reality which natural science cannot note or measure. The Christian religion is, first of all, a fact which constitutes an essential part of human history. It is, secondly, an object of choice or free appropriation. The choice must be between Christianity and Buddhism, since Judaism is merely an undeveloped Christianity and Islam is practically out of the field. As compared with Buddhism, Christianity is far more zealous and successful in its propagandism, and at the same time presents truth far better adapted to the needs of mankind. Christianity in its historical form may be considered as a present fact, to be reckoned with and experienced. Properly understood, Christianity is neither that form of evangelism which makes so much of awakening, nor that which lays the emphasis upon pietistic feelings and conceptions of duty, nor that which is largely taken up with the Church and its forms and ceremonies. Christianity is experienced normally in the education of the Christian home and the Christian congregation or community by contact with Christian institutions and personalities. This gives us a threefold experience: first, that, notwithstanding our imperfections, we are children of God, from whom we have received forgiveness of sin; secondly, that we become superior to all the vicissitudes of life by regarding them, in patience and faith in God, as expressions of the divine will concerning us; thirdly, that out of the will of God thus discovered we learn the true conduct of life and receive the courage to live righteously in the face of all obstacles. But Christianity may be considered also as a remembrance which connects us with the past, and by which we become heirs of the past. Yet we must learn in this connection to submit to the loss of specific elements of Christian history and doctrine which have hitherto been precious to us, when further investigation reveals their untenability. We must also recognize that the religious value of a fact or movement in Christian history can be determined alone in the light of our own religious experience. This last point is very far-reach-

ing, and if kept in mind would save us many a pang in this day of overturnings. It is notable that the emphasis is placed where Wesley placed it, namely, on experience as a means of determining both the truth and the religious value of the Christian past as recorded in the Scriptures.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Die Propheten in ihrem sozialen Beruf und das Wirtschaftsleben ihrer Zeit. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Sozialethik (The Social Vocation of the Prophets and the Economic Life of their Time. A Contribution to the History of Social Ethics). By Franz Walter. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1900. This book furnishes, first of all, a survey of the economic development of Israel prior to the time of the prophets. Originally the Israelites in Canaan gave themselves up almost exclusively to agriculture. David began indirectly to encourage commerce, and with Solomon appeared a real commercial policy. As Palestine was very fertile, commerce was chiefly concerned with the trade in grain, especially with Phœnicia. This change from a purely agricultural existence to one in which foreign commerce had a large place brought with it important consequences for the nation in respect to the economic, social, moral, and religious life. Wealth increased; but especially the land and its products became the object of speculation, and as these were made tributary to private gain the country was less capable of sustaining itself in time of famine. Large wealth increased prices. The soil and the currency became the possession of a very few capitalists; and on the one side appeared people of enormous wealth, while on the other there was deep poverty. The middle classes disappeared. The authorities did nothing to check or correct the abuses which this state of affairs carried with it. The real source of the difficulty, however, was not the change from agriculture to commerce, but the fact that with this there came a change for the worse among the people both in morals and religion. Their thought was now fixed on gain, and the ties of family were ignored. Foreign traders settled in the principal cities, bringing with them their foreign customs and forms of worship. This engendered indifference to the ancient moral and religious traditions. In the midst of this situation appear the prophets. They are not socialists in the political sense, nor are they agrarian reformers. They do not champion the cause of the *bourgeoisie*. They struggled chiefly against the injustice that was being practiced, and strove to secure the betterment of the individual ethical life, in order to give to the needy classes more favorable conditions. Their voices were raised against the general moral ruin, the luxury of the strong at the expense of the weak, the evils of alcoholism, and the disintegration of family life. They make no claim that riches and trade are essentially sinful, though they do bitterly oppose the selling of bad grain to the poor and

condemn false weights and the withholding of wages. But, while all these abuses were denounced by the prophets, they entertained and preached no revolutionary ideas. On the other hand, had it not been for the prophets Israel would have experienced a mighty communistic movement. This is a most interesting discussion in these days when everything which pertains to the subject of sociology, whether ancient or modern, is so eagerly sought after. Possibly, when the author says that the preponderance of earthly and selfish over religious ideals began from the time of Solomon to be a stigma upon the history of Israel, he is somewhat extreme; but, on the whole, his picture of the social responsibilities of the prophets is correct.

Die Anschauung vom heiligen Geiste bei Luther. Eine historisch-dogmatische Untersuchung (Luther's Idea of the Holy Spirit. An Historico-Dogmatic Study). By Rudolph Otto. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. For many millions of Christians Luther's theological opinions have enormous weight, which explains the effort of every theological tendency in Germany to find support in him. As a result, it has fallen to the lot of few mortals to be studied as Luther has been and still is. That he deserves all the attention bestowed on him is unquestionable, for was he not the prince among religious reformers in the sixteenth century? Nevertheless, it is a striking commentary on the alleged independence of German theological thought that, however far away from the traditional orthodoxy one may stray, and howsoever powerfully he may sustain his views with arguments drawn from every source, he never feels quite satisfied until he has convinced himself and has attempted to convince his readers or hearers that Luther's views carried to their logical consequences either demand or allow unorthodox conclusions. It is in this spirit that Otto has written, and he comes as near making out his case as most who have delved in the inexhaustible mine of Luther's thinkings for materials in support of their peculiar views. Otto argues that Luther, as has been generally supposed, held the doctrine of the Trinity as a truth not to be questioned. But he thinks that Luther's doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the third Person in the Holy Trinity did not spring from his own thought, but was held as a dogma received from the past. He asserts that as soon as we examine into Luther's concrete representations of the work of the Holy Spirit we find that the Spirit has no true place along with the Father and the Son. According to the orthodox faith, after the Son has accomplished the redemption of man it is the work of the Spirit to give each individual the power to appropriate for himself that redemption. And here, in thought, is a distinct work for the Holy Spirit alongside of the office of the Father and the Son. Yet Otto thinks that, with Luther, the office of the Spirit is not to aid man in appropriating the redemption of Christ, but to produce certain moral and religious

effects, such as comforting the heart, awakening courage to consecrate ourselves to and confide in God, kindling love to God instead of our former fear, and, in general, of calling forth every moral energy hitherto latent in our entire being. This result of the workings of the Holy Spirit is to Luther the Gospel. Otto is no doubt correct in thinking that Luther laid the chief stress on these religious and moral effects. But this only shows that not every fact tenaciously held as a dogma is frequently before the mind, or, at most, that some opinions necessary to consistent thinking are not practically important—a phenomenon no more to be condemned in theology than in science. But Otto is undoubtedly in error when he tries to make it appear that Luther gave no special office to the Holy Spirit alongside of the offices of the Father and the Son. For the great reformer believed that only by the Holy Spirit is the word of revelation, whether to the race as a whole or to the individual, a truly divine word. The Gospel and the office of the Holy Spirit are not, to the mind of Luther, one and the same.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

Old Catholicism in Italy and the Netherlands. The Reformed Catholic Church of San Remo recently enjoyed the rare privilege of a visit from Father Hyacinthe, who preached twice and gave the work an impetus which will be felt for a long time to come. The Old Catholics of the Netherlands, or the Jansenistic Church of Utrecht, which arose out of the Jansenistic controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is also taking on new activity. According to the *Oudkathalek*, the organ of the Old Catholics of Holland, there are now twenty-eight congregations, of which that at Egmont has 1,680 members. The whole number of members in 1900 was 8,300, as against 5,287 in 1875. The membership is united, full of religious earnestness, and active in the work. The expectations for the twentieth century are great, as it is believed that the principal dangers of the Church are past. It is significant that the Hollanders in Paris number a sufficient force to warrant the ordination of a deacon to serve them.

Jews in China. There are several hundreds of these living in Shanghai and inland. In Tangschwang, southwest of Kaifungtu, there is an old Jewish colony of silk weavers. In Kaifungtu and its vicinity most of the Jews have about lost all their old religious views and customs. They have no synagogue and no rabbi; they do not observe the Sabbath; and they cannot read the Hebrew. One of the Jews is a Buddhist priest. They intermarry with Mohammedans and heathen. All this is a degeneration from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when Jesuit missionaries found there a stately group of buildings, including a synagogue, and over forty Jewish inscriptions, some of which

reach back into the fifteenth century. These inscriptions reveal the fact that when the Jews arrived in China they honored Abraham as the founder of their religion, Moses, Ezra, the law, and the Sabbath; that they offered the three daily prayers, and observed the day of atonement. Also that they were favorably received by the emperor, given grants of land, and allowed the free exercise of their religion, on condition that they would become his loyal subjects. The Jews of Kaifungtu observe with the Chinese the worship of ancestors, and bring offerings to the dead. The first Jews settled in China, according to the supposition, sometime before 220 A. D.

German-Italian Congregations. Of these there are at least six, situated in Naples, Venice, San Remo, Genoa, and Florence. Prosperity seems to attend each of these congregations, and some of them have taken measures to become organically connected with the Prussian National Church. In Florence an organization of women has opened a hospital for the care of Germans. With great exertion about thirty-eight thousand *lire* have been collected, with which a well-situated plot of ground has been purchased, and it is expected that a church will soon be built. In Genoa the Germans conduct a seaman's mission, of which, however, the German congregation thinks it has some occasion to be jealous. In Naples a mission has been opened for the benefit of waiters in hotels and restaurants. So that, in Italy at least, the Germans do not seem to lose the zeal for the neglected classes which characterize their Church at home. An effort is being made to unite all these German-Italian congregations more closely, with a view of preparing them to become the nucleus of a German foreign Church.

Mariolatry in France. A congress for the promotion of the veneration of Mary was recently held in Lyons, and was attended by thirty-five bishops and five hundred priests. The opening address was delivered by the Abbé Chatelus, who declared that the congress had been called because the nineteenth century was the century of Mary. "Upon what page of history," he exclaimed, "can one find facts of such far-reaching significance as the definition of the dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary and the assignment of two new titles of honor to the Virgin by Pius IX and Leo XIII?" The congress was invited to France because *regnum Galliae regnum Mariae.* The divine Saviour chose Judea as the scene of his teaching; Mary chose France, where Lourdes, La Lallette, and so many other places testify to her presence. And Lyons was chosen because here was erected the first altar to the Queen of Heaven. The cardinal archbishop, Couilié of Lyons, spoke of Mary as the co-redeemer; and a Jesuit celebrated her praises as the Judith of the New Testament, which, to most of us would appear a doubtful compliment. However, Roman and Protestant ethics differ.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

THOUGH the negro problem in the South is far from settlement, yet the frequent discussion of the subject in the magazines is an indication of the serious place it holds in the public thought. Two articles in the *New World* (Boston) for December, 1900—with which number, by the way, this weighty quarterly discontinues its publication—give prominence to important phases of the question. The first of these papers is entitled "The Religion of the American Negro," and is written by that able representative of his race, Professor W. E. Burghardt Du Bois. A "peculiar ethical paradox," he declares, "faces the negro of to-day, and is tingeing and changing his religious life. Feeling that his rights and his dearest idols are being trampled upon, that the public conscience is even more deaf to his righteous appeal, and that all the reactionary forces of prejudice, greed, and revenge are daily gaining new strength and fresh allies, the negro faces no enviable dilemma. Conscious of his impotence, and pessimistic, he often becomes bitter and vindictive, and his religion, instead of a worship, is a complaint and a curse, a wail rather than a hope, a sneer rather than a faith. On the other hand, another type of mind, shrewder and keener and more tortuous, too, sees in the very strength of the anti-negro movement its patent weaknesses, and with Jesuitic casuistry is deterred by no ethical considerations in the endeavor to turn this weakness to the black man's strength. Thus we have two great and hardly reconcilable streams of thought and ethical strivings; the danger of the one lies in anarchy, that of the other in hypocrisy. The one type of negro stands almost ready to curse God and die, and the other is too often found a traitor to right and a coward before force; the one is wedded to ideals remote, whimsical, perhaps impossible of realization; the other forgets that life is more than meat and the body more than raiment. But, after all, is not all this simply the writhing of the age translated into black—the triumph of the Lie which to-day, with its false culture, faces the hideousness of the anarchist assassin? . . . Between the two extreme types of ethical attitude which I have thus sought to make clear wavers the mass of the millions of negroes North and South; and their religious life and activity partake of this social conflict within their ranks. Their churches are differentiating; now into groups of cold, fashionable devotees, in no way distinguishable from similar white groups save in color of skin; now into large social and business institutions catering to the desire for information and amusement of their members, warily avoiding unpleasant questions both within and without the black world, and preaching in effect, if not in word, *Dum vivimus, vivamus.*" The second article in the same quarterly discusses "Negro Education," its author being Hollis

Burke Frissell, of Hampton, Va. Having noticed the discipline that the colored man received during the Civil War, the attempts at negro education in the reconstruction period immediately following that struggle, and the later efforts to solve the great problem which have had their climax in the industrial training of Hampton and Tuskegee, the author finally says: "Yet the results of thirty years of negro education are by no means discouraging. Statistics show that negro illiteracy has decreased from 79.9 per cent, in 1870, to 56.8 per cent in 1890. The number of common and higher schools has increased, as has also the number of pupils enrolled in the schools. The status of colored teachers is constantly improving. They are respected and valued by their white neighbors, and their opportunities for broader culture are increasing year by year through the teachers' institutes, which are supported in part by the Peabody Education Fund. Whole communities have been revolutionized by these teachers, civilized homes have been multiplied and landholdings increased, and a large portion of the race has grown in character, self-respect, and self-reliance. The outlook for the future is most hopeful. The things to be striven for are better primary and secondary schools, more adequate equipment, more industrial training, better prepared teachers, and more hearty cooperation between the higher schools and the public school system." Nor is the outlook regarded as hopeful by this writer only. In the *North American* (New York) for February, M. L. Dawson, formerly Judge-Advocate General of Virginia, concludes his article on "The South and the Negro" as follows: "History teaches us that education, in its most comprehensive sense, is the only known means by which the desired results can be obtained. . . . The South has gone to the limit of her resources to confer this priceless gift upon the negro race. She now expends about forty millions of dollars annually in school funds, of which sum the negroes contribute but one thirtieth, though they have the opportunity to reap nearly half the benefit. In the South all trades are open to them, and they receive every encouragement to become proficient in the industrial arts. . . . Education and civilizing influences must ultimately win the victory over ignorance and vice; if they do not, education is a failure and the history of civilization a lie."

The opening article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Oberlin, O.) for January discusses "The Passage from Mind to Matter," its author being Professor Jacob Cooper. "The passage from the world without to that within us," declares the opening sentence, "is the problem which in some form has ever confronted philosophy." Seeking to find "the point of transition between the material and immaterial," the professor lays down the following as his four theses: "I. The mind cannot be localized;" "II. It is omnipotent and omnipresent in a relative sense;" "III. Mind and matter are one substance, differing only in the relative subtlety of

their composition, and are transferable into their equivalents without loss or limitation;" "IV. Therefore, they act on each other directly and immediately, and no bridge is required for them to cross." The paper is at once lengthy, profound, and lucid. The commencement address, delivered by Professor R. M. Wenley, Ph.D., at Oberlin College, June 27, 1900, forms the second article. It is entitled "The Valley of Decision," and is filled with those wholesome advices to the young whose observance makes for worldly success. The title of the third article, by Professor Howard Osgood, is "Isaiah the Myth and Isaiah the Prophet." "After eighty years," the author asks, "what is the latest word on the division of Isaiah by the followers of the school of Eichhorn?" He then adds: "It has been suggested that six of their foremost writers be taken and their results compared. Two shall be of the Episcopal Church of England—Driver and Cheyne; two shall be British Presbyterians—G. A. Smith and Skinner; and two shall be Germans—Cornill and Duhm. They are all of the same school of criticism, able, learned, and in high position, and their latest works quoted are all of the past ten years and easily found. There are no better exemplars of this school." In the comparison which he makes the professor finds that these six critics are "absolutely contradictory" in their foundation stones; that they "condemn their own past judgments;" and that in their decisions on date, style, and interpretation, each one gives his varying impressions—the result being "a knot of thorns," instead of "a bunch of fruit or a bouquet of roses." As for the real authorship of the Book of Isaiah the author himself has no doubt. But that there was a prophet by that name he finds the New Testament clearly to bear testimony. The fourth paper, by Professor T. W. Hunt, Ph.D., discusses "Coleridge and his Poetic Work," and gives the poet place "in the second group of English bards—with Moore, Southey, Landor, Scott, and Shelley." The next article, on "The Book, the Land, the People; or, Divine Revelations through Ancient Israel," is the address delivered by Professor S. I. Curtiss, D.D., at the opening of the Chicago Theological Seminary, October 4, 1900—it being altogether worthy of that prominent occasion. The following articles are "The Anthracite Coal Strike," by Professor E. L. Bogart, Ph.D.; "President Samuel Colcord Bartlett," by Professor Gabriel Campbell, S.T.D.; and "Count Tolstoy's Sociological Views," by Rev. E. A. Steiner. The last article is based upon a personal interview, and is rich in the sayings of the Russian philosopher. Though holding agnostic views as to the person of Christ, he exalts his words as divine. And his great cry is: "The kingdom of God is within you, and you are to be the pattern after which the kingdom of this world is to fashion itself."

The interests of Judaism are laid as a weighty charge upon the Christian Church, the glorious result for which all believers must devoutly

pray being the conversion of the Hebrew race to the faith of Jesus Christ. Such a new quarterly as *The People, The Land, and The Book*, whose expressed object is "to promote a better understanding between Christians and Jews, and to foster among the latter a recognition of the claims of Christianity," should therefore receive a generous welcome. Its editor is B. A. M. Schapiro, who was for several years Superintendent of the Brooklyn Christian Mission to the Jews, and who is particularly fitted by birth and endowment for the prosecution of the new work to which he now addresses himself. The June (1900) and September numbers of the publication are filled with much pertinent and instructive matter, which is calculated to help not only the Jew himself who may be searching after the light, but also the studious Christian, and even the Gospel minister who would thoroughly know the spirit and needs of Judaism. A miniature of the holy scroll containing the Pentateuch in the original is the premium presented to those subscribing for the magazine. This publication is issued at 436 Carlton Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

An important quarterly not before noticed in these pages is *The American Journal of Theology* (Chicago), edited by the divinity faculty of the University of Chicago. The opening article, by H. S. Burrage, D.D., of Portland, Me., aims to answer the question, "Why was Roger Williams Banished?" The Rev. L. H. Schwab, of New York city, follows with "A Plea for Ritschl," his elaborate consideration of the work of this theologian ending with the affirmation that, while the "process of readjustment" is taking place, "those who believe in divine providence will thank God that a great teacher has been raised up to open up to men an insight into the very core of Christianity, where the truth abides high above all questions of Bible criticism." The third article is entitled "Isaiah's Prophecy Concerning the Major-Domo of King Hezekiah," its author being Professor Adolf Kamphausen, D.D., of the University of Bonn. The three succeeding papers are: "A Tract on the Triune Nature of God," by Professor J. Rendel Harris, of Cambridge, Eng.; "A New Criticism of Hegelianism—Is it Valid?" by Professor G. H. Mead, Ph.D., of the University of Chicago; and "Theological Universities and Theology in the Universities," by E. C. Richardson, Ph.D., of Princeton—the latter declaring, among other matters of practical value, that, "until the universities relegate biology and psychology to the medical schools they have no right to relegate theology to the seminaries." The concluding sections of the quarterly are entitled "Critical Note" and "Recent Theological Literature." The former contains a study, by C. P. Coffin, of "Two Sources for the Synoptic Account of the Last Supper;" the latter is rich in the review of late important publications, both American and foreign, and is too valuable to be overlooked by the scholar.

BOOK NOTICES.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

A Dictionary of the Bible: Dealing with its Language, Literature, and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., with the assistance of John Selbie, M.A., and others. Vol. III. Kir-Pleiades. 4to, pp. xv-896. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, cloth, $6.

The fourth volume, when it comes, will complete a monumental work, perhaps the best possible at the present stage of scholarship and research. This volume, like the two previous ones, is for professional and non-professional circles, for readers of the English Bible and for students of the original. Much attention is given to the authorized and the revised English versions, to illustrating and explaining especially the language of the old version, and to the study of archaic, anomalous, or otherwise difficult English words. To some it seems that an undue share of space has been allowed to the literary form of the English versions and to explanations which have little or no historical or theological bearing. To us, however, none of the matter so referred to seems without value, and because of its interest and usefulness to the English reader, and especially to the working minister, we are glad to find it here. The three volumes now published are of sustained excellence, this one like the others being characterized by eminent learning, candor, reverence, and sobriety of mind. To say that it is, as a whole, remarkably free from eccentricities of treatment and from extreme and unwarranted views, is not to say either that its judgment is inerrant, or that its conclusions are sure to stand, or that the teaching of every specialist in it will command the present assent of soundly conservative scholars. Written by one hundred and fourteen different contributors—three Germans, fourteen Americans, and the rest British—it is not to be expected that it would show uniformity of temper and attitude. The writers could not be classified all in one school, though the preface to this volume tells us that they have been chosen out of respect to their scholarship and nothing else; that the articles all have been written immediately and solely for this Dictionary; that even the shortest and unsigned ones are from men of recognized ability and authority; and that, in addition to the work put upon it by authors and editors, every sheet has passed through the hands of three eminent scholars, Dr. Davidson, of Edinburgh, Dr. Driver, of Oxford, and Dr. Swete, of Cambridge. Almost the only frivolous suggestion we have noticed, arising from the specialist's tendency to exaggerate the importance and bearing of petty items in his own department, is the notion on p. 431 that the historic fact that the Jews never were permitted the constitutional privilege of coining money in silver or gold is a proof or token of the purely spiritual character of their mission. That kind of weak and imaginative reasoning, which fills homiletical mag-

azines and books with sentimental, visionary, and flighty trash, is not to be tolerated in the scientific work of biblical scholars; and it is a pleasure to be able to say that Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* has hardly a microscopic trace of it. Whatever criticism may be passed on any particular article, it cannot be charged that the work is not upon a high plane of scholarly ability, seriousness, carefulness, and religious dignity. When completed, the four volumes will furnish a vast storehouse of biblical and cognate information, as thoroughly up to date and approved by a general consensus of modern scholarship as can well be. The particular section of the alphabet, from K to P, covered by the index to this third volume, does not include the greatest subjects belonging to a Bible dictionary; yet there is no lack of themes of prime significance and interest, nor of writers of the first order of ability. If asked to select one which might fairly compete for the first place in ability and impressiveness, we would name the article by Professor Findlay, of Headingly, on "Paul the Apostle," who justly ranks in Christian history next to his divine Lord and Saviour—an article filling about seventy columns and containing a multitude of items condensed into a presentation so unified, symmetrical, and complete as to be at once a masterpiece of scholarship and a work of art like some great statue or picture. Any adequate criticism or examination of the particular teachings of the various articles is impossible here and now; there are not a few single articles each of which would require many pages for a sufficient discussion. Such discussion is beyond the scope of this notice, which seeks only to give a true impression of the character of this work and a not inaccurate estimate of its value. The articles on Peter are by Dr. F. H. Chase, who concludes against the genuineness of 2 Peter. Professor Stanton, of Cambridge, writes on the New Testament Canon, showing the reasons for accepting the New Testament writings as inspired to be based in part on Apostolic testimony, in part on the testimony of Apostolic Fathers and of the early Church Fathers. The express statements of such authorities as Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus, and their assumptions, prove that nearly all of our New Testament was accepted by the end of the second and the beginning of the third century as of inspired authority in all the important churches. In this general acceptance were included our four gospels and none other; thirteen epistles of Paul, that is all which bear his name in our New Testament except Hebrews; the Acts of the Apostles; 1 Peter; and 1 John. The writings which came into the Canon later are the Epistle of James, 2 Peter, and 3 John, and still later the Apocalypse. Professor Curtis, of Yale Divinity School, fills seventeen columns on the "Old Testament." Professor Adams Brown, of Union Seminary, writes on "Parousia." Dr. George T. Purves, recently Professor of Exegesis and New Testament Literature at Princeton, now Dr. John Hall's successor in the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York city, writes of the "The Logos" in genuine Princetonian style.

Dr. McClymont, of Aberdeen, in the article entitled "New Testament,"

effectively vindicates the genuineness and authenticity of the books. On the Johannean question he writes: "Until the close of the eighteenth century the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel was never seriously challenged. In some respects it has stronger external testimony in its favor than any of the others; and the whole tone of it gives the impression that it was written by one who was familiar with the inner life of Christ and his apostles, as well as with the topography of Jerusalem, and the ideas and customs prevalent among the Jews before the destruction of their capital." The evidence shows it to have been written about A. D. 85, probably at Ephesus. The article on "Matthew" is by Vernon Bartlet, that on "Mark" by Professor Salmond, and that on "Luke" by Principal Bebb. The geographical articles on "Lycaonia," "Pergamos," and "Phrygia" could not be by any better hand than Professor Ramsay's, and Colonel Conder is equally fit for the one on "Palestine," as also Professor McAlister for "Medicine," "Leprosy," "Plagues of Egypt," and other semiscientific subjects. Dr. Driver writes of Law in the Old Testament, and Dr. Denney, of Law in the New. Some of the articles of theological importance are "Lord's Day" by Professor White, of the University of Dublin, "Lord's Supper" by Dr. Plummer, Master of University College, Durham, "Mediator" by Adeney, "Magi" by P. M. Benecke, "Miracle" by J. H. Bernard, "Mystery" by A. Stewart, "Philosophy" by T. B. Kilpatrick. Other mentionable articles are "Apocrypha" and "Language of the Old Testament" by Margoliouth, "Language of the New Testament" and "Maranatha" by J. H. Thayer, "Latin Versions" by H. A. Kennedy, "Natural History" and similar topics by G. E. Post, Egyptian subjects by F. L. Griffith and W. M. Müller, apocalyptic and apocryphal studies by the English specialists Burkitt, Charles, and James. Professor Banks writes on "Perfection," condensing into brief statement what he understands to be the teaching of Scripture on this subject. The editor, Dr. Hastings, writes admirably on "Paraclete." The aggregation of eminent scholarship in this Dictionary makes it a theological and biblical work of the first rank and importance; its ability inspires confidence in the strategic skill and sufficiency of modern defenders of the Faith; and taken as a whole it arranges the evidences of Christianity in a way to meet and defeat the latest maneuvers of the enemies of the Truth.

The Life of Lives. Further Studies in the Life of Christ. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury and Deputy Clerk of the Closet to the Queen. Crown 8vo, pp. 444. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. Price, cloth, $2.50.

One of the most widely read books of our time is *Farrar's Life of Christ*, issued more than twenty years ago, and since translated into many languages, even into Japanese. The object of the book before us is different. It deals with questions of high importance which the gospels suggest, and aims at deepening the faith and brightening the hope in Christ of all who read it. In forty-three chapters it deals with such subjects as these: "The Divine Birth," "The Unique Supremacy of

Jesus," "The Testimony of Skeptics and Free Thinkers, "The Claims of Jesus and the Spell He Exercised, "The Human Education of Jesus," "Lessons of the Unrecorded Years," "The Home and Family at Nazareth," "The Condition of the World," "The State of Religion in Palestine," "The Messianic Hope," "John the Baptist," "Christ's Baptism," "The Temptation," "Scenes of Christ's Ministry," "Methods of Evangelization," "Form, Substance, and Uniqueness of Christ's Teaching," "The Miracles," "The Gladness and Sorrow of the Christ," "The Apostles and Their Commission," "Our Lord's Closing Days," "Gethsemane," "Trials and Suffering of Jesus," "Atonement," "Resurrection," "Ascension," "The Final Issues." What is possible here is not a discussion of the book as a whole; nor is that necessary, for the prolific pen of Farrar has made his style of thought and speech familiar throughout Christendom. This volume has the same concrete richness of expression, the same affluent and ornate vocabulary, as his previous writings. Here it is only possible to quote a few characteristic passages. Michael Faraday's devout faith is illustrated in the story that one day Sir Henry Acland found him in tears. "I fear you are not well," said Sir Henry. "No," answered Faraday, "It is not that; but why, O why will not all men believe the blessed truths here revealed to them?" Those who have conferred on the human race the greatest services of goodness have been the servants of Christ. "What was it but the pity learned from Christ, and the commission received from him, that sent forth Paul to preach the Gospel amid hatreds, miseries, and cruel persecutions, till, like the blaze of beacon fires from hill to hill, its glory flashed from Jerusalem to Antioch, to Ephesus, and to Troas, and thence leaped over the sea to Athens, to Corinth, to imperial Rome, and even to Britain, then the *ultima thule* of the world? What made the Roman lady Fabiola spend her fortune in founding hospitals at Rome and in distant lands? Why did Jerome bury himself in the Cave of the Nativity at Bethlehem to translate the Bible from Hebrew into Latin? What made the boy Benedict fly from the allurements of Rome to the Rocks of Subiaco, and found the order to which learning owes so deep a debt? Why did Bonaventura, when asked the source of his great learning, point in silence to his Crucifix? Why did Francis of Assisi strip himself of everything, and, by living as a pauper and a beggar, infuse new life and holiness into an apostate and luxurious world? What led Francis Xavier to lay aside rank and pleasures, and become a wandering missionary, gaining by his sacrifice a happiness so intense that he even prayed God not to pour upon him such a flood tide of rapture? What sent the Baptist cobbler, William Carey, to evangelize the mighty continent of Hindustan? Every one of these and thousands more whose lives have been a blessing to the world answer 'CHRIST!' What led John Howard to toil among plague-stricken prisoners, until his death at Cherson, on the Black Sea, clothed a nation in spontaneous mourning? What made Elizabeth Fry go unaccompanied among the wild, degraded, brutal

women of Newgate, to take them by the hand and raise them from disgrace and darkness? Why did men like Thomas Clarkson, Granville Sharpe, and William Wilberforce scorn delights and live laborious days in order that, in spite of opposition, reproach, and bitter hatred, they might save England from the guilt of using the arm of freedom to forge the fetters of the slave? What made Lord Shaftesbury, while yet a Harrow boy, vow himself to those works of mercy which added the brightest jewel to the glory of Queen Victoria's reign? What enabled him—amid the venomous attacks of the press and the chill aloofness of the clergy—to toil on until he had inaugurated the Ragged School movement, and passed the Ten Hours and the Factory Bills? Why should the poor Portsmouth cobbler, John Pounds, have troubled himself, day after day, to gather the ragged waifs into his shop, and teach them with letters torn down from the advertisements upon the walls, and so—poor and ignorant as he was—to give an impulse to a great national system of education? What made Sir Henry Havelock face so many sneers for holding Bible classes among his soldiers and winning them to Total Abstinence? What made General Charles George Gordon so kind to the poor, dirty, homeless boys of Greenwich? One and all, they would give the same answer, 'The love of Christ constraineth us.' . . . Let us not fail to observe that the superhuman grandeur which has invested Jesus was something wholly apart from all earthly pomp of circumstance, or splendor of endowments. When the world bows before him, it is no because of any of the gifts or qualities which ordinarily dazzle mankind. Jesus was no Poet, entrancing the souls of men with passionate melodies. He was no mighty Leader like Moses, emancipating nations from servitude, or, with illuminated countenance, promulgating to them a code of systematic morality. He was no rapt Orator, now stirring men to tumultuous emotion, now holding them hushed. He was no Warrior, smiting down his foes in triumphant victory, and breaking from the necks of the oppressed the yoke of foreign bondage. Yet turning away from the choir of immortal Poets; from famous Leaders; from mighty Orators who have played on the emotions of men as the wind on the strings of an Æolian harp; from all magnificent Conquerors; from the Pharaohs in their chariots whirling into battle; from Assyrian monarchs leading home their captives; from Babylonian emperors with the crumbs gathered from beneath their tables by vassal kings; from deified Cæsars in their dizzy exaltation; from Aurungzebe or Haroun, flaming in their jeweled robes and surrounded by kotowing courtiers—the world, abandoning all its natural predilections, has felt constrained to drop its weapons, to tear the garlands from its hair, to kneel lowly on its knees before the Son of man in His humiliation, in the faded purple of His mockery, in His crown of torturing thorns. For He was the Son of God." Concerning Buddhism, Barthélemy St. Hilaire, who made a special study of it, said, "It is a spiritualism without soul, a virtue without duty, a morality without liberty, a world without nature and

without God." Of Mohammed it is written that he did indeed render one great service to his adherents by the rigorous prohibition of strong drink; to which is due the fact the Turk makes a good, tough soldier who will recover in a fortnight from wounds which would send an ordinary English soldier to a certain grave because of his drinking habits and the poison of beer in his blood. This book would not make the reputation of Dean Farrar, but will be helped by it to a sale.

Skilled Labor for the Master. By EUGENE R. HENDRIX, D.D., LL.D., One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Introduction by Bishop C. B. GALLOWAY, LL.D. 8vo, pp. 326. Nashville: Barbee & Smith. Price, cloth, $1.25.

This volume reminds the reader of a gallery of paintings from the hand of some great master, each one of which deserves individual mention and encomium. The chapters of the book, in other words, are in some measure independent of each other and each of them worthy, both from their subject and treatment, of larger review than is here permitted. In their union they form a harmonious whole, the treatment being the consideration in a new and fascinating setting of the many intellectual and spiritual qualifications that make for ministerial success. A few random quotations will make plain the wide scope of the volume, its charming style, and its gracious spirit. In the discussion, for instance, of "A Preacher's Bookshelves" the author writes: "Often a mere glance at its Homiletical Commentaries, its 'Books of Skeletons,' its 'Sermon Helps,' its 'Pulpit Illustrations,' which constitute the major part of its stores, shows that the preacher has been building a library and a ministerial outfit under a mistaken notion as to how to meet his real needs. Such a library is more of a 'museum of crutches' than a table spread with nourishing food for the brain and heart, as well as the hands and feet. A nourished brain and a glowing heart are the best 'pulpit helps.' These canned goods on a preacher's bookshelves can never put much iron in the blood or gray matter in the brain. . . . To analyze for one's self some great sermon of another, to separate its exegesis from its argument, to verify its positions from the Holy Scriptures, to distinguish the limits of its application, to note its figures of speech and the character of its illustrations is an intellectual exercise of a high order, and may be to a preacher what an analytical study of a great masterpiece is to an artist in helping to make him a painter. One such sermon as that preached before Oxford University by Canon Mozley on 'The Reversal of Human Judgment' may be read aloud alone or in company with a fellow-preacher or in one's family; and, while its searching truths may prove a spiritual tonic for a twelvemonth, the careful study of its argument may mark an intellectual epoch in one's ministry. So of Dr. Chalmers's sermon on 'The Expulsive Power of a New Affection,' or of John Wesley's on 'The Great Assize,' or of Robert Hall's on 'Without God in the World,' or of Richard Watson's on 'Man Magnified by the Divine Regard.'" The chapter on "The Unmaking of a Preacher" has this always truthful statement: "Arrested development,

whether it be mental or spiritual, is alike a disease and a symptom. Bad as it is in itself, it frequently indicates a moral bankruptcy which affects both mind and heart. People are quick to distinguish a religious vocabulary from a religious experience. Their ears can tell the sounding brass and clanging cymbal, even though a man speak with the tongues of angels. He may have had a genuine religious experience, a very vision of the Lord by the way; and it is fitting to refer to it, as Paul did to his at the most critical moments of his ministry. But such an experience should be more than a memory; it should be an inspiration. His midday vision quickened Paul's whole intellectual and spiritual life." True to the teachings of the fathers upon the power and need of the Spirit is the author's utterance in the chapter on "The Anointed Preacher." He says: "The true Shekinah is a holy man. The symbol of the divine presence may ever be seen in the tongue of fire. It is the unction, the anointing from the Holy One. What a new discovery of the divine resources comes with a knowledge of the Holy Spirit! . . . Unless there be the heart of fire, there cannot be the tongue of flame. It is the burning core within that yields the flaming tongue on the volcano's brow." The true object of preaching, continues the writer, in his chapter on "The Ministry of Intercession," is as follows: "His preaching is best adapted to what is called a revival occasion each of whose sermons is suited for a revival because he ever keeps in mind that persuasion is the real end of preaching. Such a man of God is always seeking to make full proof of his ministry in the conversion of souls, as well as in beseeching men to present their bodies a living sacrifice to God. There is enough Gospel truth in every such sermon to save a soul. Happy that preacher who can say what was said by Phillips Brooks when, after preaching before Queen Victoria, he was asked what sermon he preached. 'What sermon?' he asked; 'I have but one sermon; that is Christ.' It sometimes will happen that some one is hearing his last sermon from your lips. Let there be enough of Christ in it to save both thyself and them that hear it." And, finally, in his discussion of "The Church of the Future," the author has this to say, among much that is pertinent: "The Church of the future will be powerless before the problem of the world's conversion without a full consecration of brain and heart and purse that work. The power of the apostolic Church was seen in the dedication of their all to the work of saving the world. But that was a small world compared with ours. The territory embraced in the American republic is twice that embraced in the Roman empire in the proudest day of its history. More tongues are spoken in our borders than ever Rome compelled to subjection. In this mighty work of the world's conversion we must have disciplined, trained workers and an unbroken front. Our forces must not be weakened before the ramparts of heathenism by some Achan eager for the wedge of gold and the Babylonish garment, more anxious for the profits from the sale of opium or rum than for the salvation of the heathen. . . .

O Church of the living Christ, this is your crowning and, if faithful, your speedy work—the conversion of the world ! And from this work will come so gracious an influence upon a religious life of the Church as to fit her indeed to become the Lamb's wife." From these abbreviated extracts the reader will infer the scope and value of the volume. Besides the chapters already mentioned others are entitled: "After Graduation, What?" "The Obligations of Professional Life," "Gristle Turned to Bone," "Dead Reckoning," "The Sacrifice of the Will," "The Sacrament of Suffering," "Fainting Fits," "The Guest of God," "'Letting the Light Shine,'" "My Parish is the World," "A Pastor's Perplexity," "The Pastor's Personal Staff," "Skilled Labor for Christ," "Our Methodist Liturgy," and "Isaiah as a City Preacher." We cannot, in conclusion, overstate the worth of the book. The ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as well as of our sister Church in the South, might well read it—and in its reading would find rare intellectual stimulus and spiritual uplift.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Jesus Christ and The Social Question. By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. 12mo, pp. 374. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, $1.50.

An observant American economist once said, "When I hear anyone bring forward a solution of the social question, I move to adjourn;" by which he meant that no complete and immediate solution of all problems involved is yet practicable. No one can propose a panacea for all social ills. Yet, vast and intricate as the problem is, the brain and conscience of Christendom grow more resolute and strenuous in the endeavor to mitigate those ills, if a full solution be not possible. The question of this book is how far the teachings and example of Jesus are of value for the desired solution. Its seven chapters consider the comprehensiveness and social principles of the teaching of Jesus; his teaching concerning the family, the rich, the care of the poor, the industrial order; and the correlation of the social question. The author begins by saying that the present age is conscious of a distinct mission and burdened with a sense of responsibility for the fulfillment thereof. "Behind the extraordinary achievements of modern civilization, its transformations of business methods, its miracles of scientific discovery, its mighty combinations of political forces, there lies at the heart of the present time a burdening sense of social maladjustment which creates what we call the social question. . . . Never were so many people, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, philosophers and agitators, men and women, stirred by social ills, by dreams of a better social world, and by the call to social service. . . . Among human interests, the social question is just now central and commanding." And the pendulum has swung from a Christology which ignored the social question to one which finds that question the center of the Gospel. The demand of radicals is not

for the amelioration of the evils of the existing order, but the destruction of that order. The fabric of modern civilization appears to rest on three social institutions—the family, private property, and the State. Each of these is challenged; the first is said to have outlived its usefulness, the second is called a mere symbol of social oppression, and the third is declared to be a mere instrument of the privileged class, which ought to be supplanted by a cooperative commonwealth of collective ownership. Social and economic revolution is the solution proposed by the radicals. Such insurgent proposals seem to some a portent of coming chaos, and to others the sunrise of a happy era of brotherhood and justice. Men like Bebel, and Friedrich Engels, and Marx, and Belfort Bax include the institutions and habits of the Christian religion among the obstacles which must be removed before a better social order can come in; but Dr. Peabody, regarding the social question as an ethical and religious question, aims to show, and does it with great thoroughness and success, that the better order can come only by the practical application of the teachings of Jesus, in the spirit of Henry Van Dyke's lines in "The Toiling of Felix:"

> Where the weary toil together, there am I among my own,
> Where the tired workman sleepeth, there am I with him alone.
> This is the Gospel of labor—ring it, ye bells of the kirk,
> The Lord of Love came down from above to live with the men who work.

The volume before us goes very far toward giving indubitable theoretic proof that Christianity can accomplish what is possible to no power or wisdom without the Gospel; and it also points the way by which the Christian Church may furnish the practical proof which shall convince all unbelievers and turn the hatred of its enemies into love. This book contains the most systematic and scientific inquiry ever made, so far as we know, concerning the social teachings of Jesus; and is for the Christian minister or layman the most instructive and valuable discussion of the social question. A significant fact of our time is the degree to which the Carpenter of Nazareth keeps his place in the confidence of the oppressed and dissatisfied. Much as many of them misconceive him, they yet trust him. Renan said, "Jesus, in one view, was an anarchist;" Pflüger said, "The first proclaimers of the Gospel, especially Jesus himself, belonged to the proletariat;" a prominent socialist said, "If Jesus were here to-day, he would be one of us;" another wrote, "Christ was a poor workingman, who had a heart for the poor—he is the man for us." Göhre says that all that remains of Christian faith among workingmen is their respect and reverence for Jesus Christ; they all stand reverently and quiet before his great personality. To those who are alarmed at the social ferment of our day the following has a reassuring thought: "The social questions are, in their main scope and intent, manifestations of the moral life of the time. They are ethical questions. They appear in forms which are political or industrial, but behind these diversities of form works the one spirit.

Against the lust of the flesh there rises up the instinct of chaste love and creates the social question of the family; against the lust of riches there appear the emotions of benevolence and pity and create the problem of charity; against economic injustice there rises up the hope of an industrial commonwealth and creates the labor question. The social questions occur simply because a very large number of people are trying in many different ways to do what is right. The moral life is written across the face of the time in the language of the social questions. The social energy of the modern conscience finds its main channel of expression in the social forces of modern reform." To the question, What is the place of the Church in the modern world? Professor Peabody answers: "It is not a place where correctness of opinion is guarded and maintained; not a cold-storage warehouse for uncorrupted truth; not merely a place of religious utterance, nor of religious symbolism, nor a gymnasium of ritual for the calisthenics of the soul. It is, to use the language of our modern life, a 'power house,' where there is generated a supply of spiritual energy sufficient to move the world with wisdom, courage, peace. Let this power fail, and a church stands in the midst of modern life without adequate reason for existence, a Sunday club, an entertainment bureau, a survival of the days when religion was real. A living Church communicates power. An irony of religious teaching it is, and a deliberate withdrawal of the influence of Christianity from any bearing on the concerns of modern life, when it is proposed to prolong the ancient controversies of orthodoxy, or ritual, or organization, as though they in any degree represented the ends to which Jesus devoted himself, or could be of the slightest concern to those who are meeting the needs of the present age. According to the teaching of Jesus, the Christian Church is to be, not a deposit of opinion but a source of spiritual energy, a mighty social dynamic, a fountain of life, creative, redemptive, self-propagating." Concerning one of the most urgent and distressing social questions, the following is part of the author's thought: "Temperance reform is but a labor of Sisyphus, and the burden it desires to remove rolls back on the community again, unless the agitation is consistently directed not so much to the hampering of a trade, as to the disciplining of a passion. The drink habit is in very large degree the perversion of one of the most universal of human desires, the thirst for exhilaration, recreation, and joy, and to remove the only available means for satisfying this normal craving without providing adequate substitutes, is like blocking the channel where a stream does harm without observing how many new fields the same stream is likely to devastate."

An American Anthology. Edited by EDMUND CLARENCE STEDMAN, editor of *A Victorian Anthology.* 8vo, pp. 878. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, $3.

What he did in the former volume for the poetry of the nineteenth century written on British soil, Mr. Stedman has here done for the

poetry of this country written between 1787 and 1899. It is hardly too much to say that no other living person has the combined knowledge, taste, and literary judgment for making such selections from modern English verse on both sides of the sea so wisely and well as has been done in the two choice volumes which should stand side by side in every library, public or private. *An American Anthology* is a collection made in illustration of Stedman's critical review of our own poets and poetry in his volume entitled *Poets of America*, as his *Victorian Anthology* was an illustration of the judgments in his *Victorian Poets*. Whoever has those four volumes does not absolutely need anything more upon the field they cover; or, at most, he can find nothing better. This selection reaches from Philip Freneau, 1787, to Joseph B. Gilder, 1900, and is preceded by the editor's fine Introduction and followed by concise Biographical Notes and a threefold index of titles, first lines, and authors. Among the early poems of the century is one by Timothy Dwight, president of Yale College, in 1784, entitled "The Smooth Divine," which hints that Dr. Dwight thought not ill of Methodism.

> There smiled the smooth Divine, unused to wound
> The sinner's heart with hell's alarming sound.
> No terrors on his gentle tongue attend;
> No grating truths the nicest ear offend.
> That strange new birth, that Methodistic grace,
> Nor in his heart nor sermons found a place.
> Plato's fine tales he clumsily retold,
> Trite, fireside, moral seesaws, dull as old,—
> His Christ and Bible placed at good remove,
> Guilt hell-deserving, and forgiving love.
> 'Twas best, he said, mankind should cease to sin:
> Good fame required it; so did peace within.
> Their honors, well he knew, would ne'er be driven;
> But hoped they still would please to go to heaven.
> Each week he paid his visitation dues;
> Coaxed, jested, laughed; rehearsed the gossips' news;
> Smoked with each goody, thought her cheese excelled;
> Her pipe he lighted, and her baby held.
> Or placed in some great town, with lacquered shoes,
> Trim wig, and trimmer gown, and glistening hose,
> He bowed, talked politics, learned manners mild,
> Most meekly questioned, and most smoothly smiled.

Still further pungent satire on the dainty, pampered, and compliant divine is followed by the same author's still familiar hymn, "I love thy kingdom, Lord;" and it may be noted that hymns have their proportionate space in this selection. The First Lyrical Period begins fitly and forcibly with John Pierpont's "The Fugitive Slave's Apostrophe to the North Star," "Warren's Address to the American Soldiers," and "The Pilgrim Fathers," with Fitz-Greene Halleck's "Marco Bozzaris." Daniel Webster is here with his verses, "On the Death of My Son Charles." The earliest really great name in American poetry is Bryant's, and the next, by home and foreign judgment, is Poe. One marked feature of this volume is that American history, especially in its critical

and passionate eras, is fully and thrillingly sung by many poets of patriotism, the singers of the South as well as of the North. An artistic purpose, the result of which is noticeable in the order of arrangement, is confessed in the editor's Introduction. "The anthologist may well follow the worker in mosaic or stained glass, to better his general effects. Humble bits, low in color, have values of juxtaposition, and often bring out to full advantage his more striking material. The representation of a leading poet is to be considered by itself, and it is a pleasure to obtain for it a suitable prelude and epilogue, and otherwise to secure a just variety of mood and range." It was impossible that so conscientious and sensitive a literary artist as Mr. Stedman should offer a careless heap of miscellaneous stuff. Rather, we find a master's hand in the arrangement, as in the selection, and in each poem some peculiar note which prevents it from being worthless or insignificant. The value of the collection is enhanced by the general aim to represent each poet variously and at his best. Mr. Stedman is aware that "there is no reception more distrustful, not to say cynical, than that awarded nowadays to a presentment of the artistic efforts of one's own time and people;" nevertheless he laudably includes, in full and just representation, the writings of living poets, honoring and not slighting his contemporaries; and for this we applaud and heartily thank him. Ancestor worship is not the most useful cult; to appreciate those who now are "fellow-heirs with us of this small island, Life, with whom we live and work as brothers," is the foremost and nearest duty. To neglect our homes while we tend the graves of the dead is to reverse the proper order of duties. Those of us who despise the work of our contemporaries would have despised the greatest of the ancients if we had lived with them. No churlish, grudging, and exclusive editor is Stedman, but one who does justice even to the youngest of those who sing true song, not yet rated great, but on the way, perhaps, to that distinction; and even to minor singers who sound some one note worth our hearing. Edgar Fawcett is absent from the volume by his own request. But T. B. Aldrich is here with twenty-eight subjects, and that fine spirit, E. R. Sill, and that most piquant, intense, small package of *die ewige Weiblich*, named Emily Dickinson, with her niece Martha Dickinson. Here are Henry Van Dyke and James B. Kenyon and Frederic Lawrence Knowles and Edwin Markham with John Vance Cheney answering him, and Julie Lippman. Here is Richard Hovey, who sends no more songs from Vagabondia, mourned by Stedman as a bright star vanished short of its meridian, and Maurice Thompson whom we cannot help regarding as, on the whole, a greater loss. Here is Charles Henry Luders with his exquisite "The Four Winds," and Will H. Thompson with his "High-tide at Gettysburg." And Paul Dunbar and Stephen Crane, and Daniel Dawson with "The Seeker in the Marshes," and Ella Wheeler Wilcox with "Recrimination," and that glib, copious versifier Francis Saltus Saltus—even these are here under the roof of Stedman's generously hospitable cara-

vansary. Among recent poems, worthy of note, is Markham's weirdly grand conception, "A Look into the Gulf:"

> I looked one night, and there Semiramis,
> With all her mourning doves about her head,
> Sat rocking on an ancient road of Hell,
> Withered and eyeless, chanting to the moon
> Snatches of song they sang to her of old
> Upon the lighted roofs of Nineveh.
> And then her voice rang out with rattling laugh:
> "The bugles! they are crying back again—
> Bugles that broke the nights of Babylon,
> And then went crying on through Nineveh.
> . . . . . .
> Stand back, ye trembling messengers of ill!
> Women, let go my hair: I am the Queen,
> A whirlwind and a blaze of swords to quell
> Insurgent cities. Let the iron tread
> Of armies shake the earth. Look, lofty towers:
> Assyria goes by upon the wind!"
>
> And so she babbles by the ancient road,
> While cities turned to dust upon the Earth
> Rise through her whirling brain to live again—
> Babbles all night, and when her voice is dead
> Her weary lips beat on without a sound.

There is a wild pathos in this ghostly picture of the ancient Assyrian queen, a shriveled crone in the inferno of the spirit world, imagining in a delirium of memory that she is once more with her armies and issuing her imperial commands.

Evolution and Theology. By OTTO PFLEIDERER, D.D. Crown 8vo, pp. 306. London: Adam & Charles Black. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, $2.

These ten essays are occasional writings of the Berlin University Professor of Theology, whose larger works have had due notice in our pages. The first gives title to the book, and the others are on "Theology and Historical Science," "Luther as the Founder of Protestant Civilization," "The Essence of Christianity," "The Notion and Problem of the Philosophy of Religion," "The Task of Scientific Theology for the Church of the Present," "Jesus's Foreknowledge of His Sufferings and Death," "The National Traits of the Germans as Seen in Their Religion," "Is Morality without Religion Possible or Desirable?" and "Free from Rome!" While affirming his loyalty to the Christian faith, indeed imagining himself a defender and deliverer of it, Pfleiderer, with his naturalism, entirely shuts out miracle of every kind, and reduces Christianity and its Lord to a very pale reflection of the orthodox conception. With his acute mind, his clear and pointed style, he is one of the subtlest and most dangerous underminers of all faith in the supernatural. He is foremost among those who think to retain the essence of Christianity without its facts, to improve it by repudiating the doctrines which have been its glory and its power; who propose to retain the

flame while removing the candle. Pfleiderer holds that neither the Jesus of the Gospel history nor the Pauline Christ is for us a binding object of faith; that the Christ of the orthodox is a being who is neither God nor man, a hybrid, accessible neither by means of rational thinking nor by poetic contemplation; that as the divine principle which enlightens every man has revealed itself in an extraordinary manner in some individuals by reason of the especial force and purity of their consciousness of God, so in Jesus we see the most powerful human organ of that principle, and he takes highest rank among these prophets of the rational God-consciousness. This, Pfleiderer says, is the conception required by a strictly scientific view of history; and theology, if it claims to be a science, must accord with the principles recognized in all science. If we were in a rationalistic Unitarian pulpit or professorship, we would feed and fill ourselves with Pfleiderer, certain that he would make somewhat less feeble (even if no less futile) our difficult endeavor to persuade men to obey and trust in a merely human Christ, a rather unusually endowed Jew, and to accept a Christianity with nothing super-earthly in its authority or its nature. But this limp, lowered, and devitalized gospel cannot abide the fire-tests of time, which let the true and genuine stand and cause the unreal and false to pass away. After all the liberties he takes and the reductions he inflicts upon Holy Scripture, the Christian history, and traditional conceptions of the Truth, Pfleiderer declares his purpose to devote all his powers in order to "maintain the holy inheritance of the fathers unimpaired amidst the storms of the present time, and to give it an ever-richer development and a finer form for the welfare of the coming generations." When this German rationalist shall have finished his work on "the holy inheritance" transmitted by "the fathers," those wise and faithful worthies will not be able to recognize it. The third essay, on "Luther and Protestant Civilization," showing that the great reformer was the founder not only of the purified Church which bore his name, but also of the Protestant civilization in which we all live and move, gives more satisfaction in the reading, though one of its first pages sets us to wondering how a man can, as is there implied, "join his heart with Christ so that the two become one spiritual person, receiving into his own heart the bright portrait of the Saviour with all the saving powers that stream forth from Him," without accepting the history of Christ as true. The forever unanswered question rises perpetually, When these iconoclasts have destroyed the Christ of the New Testament, what ground or authority have they for any Christ at all? The largeness, richness, and wholesomeness of Luther's nature are finely set forth. Next to theology, he considered music to be God's most precious gift, and he knew how to employ it in the service of the Highest. A true saying is that "the German people owe it to Luther that there has been a Bach or a Handel." He was the creator of the German hymn, and the immense influence upon his contemporaries of those which he wrote was recognized by his enemies, for a Jesuit

wrote, "Luther's hymns have slain more souls than all books and sermons," which is a testimony to the power of Christian hymns in general. The author says that "German science owes to Luther nothing less than body and soul; for the body of science is language, and the soul is the conscientious sense for truth and the impulse to free investigation. These two it has from Luther and only from him. He created for the German people the unified language which for centuries has been the single bond of the politically rent and divided tribes. And what a language! What fullness of forms, what flexibility of structure, what power of expression did it win under his master hand! Lessing's clearness, Schiller's power, and Goethe's euphony are combined in Luther's speech. Therefore it is, and remains the model of all who write and speak German." Of the wide influence of the freedom-breathing nature of Luther's spirit and language the author writes: "It was Luther's spirit which arose victorious in Lessing to free us from the intolerable yoke of the letter. In Luther's spirit and in the footsteps of his criticism of dogma a Kant proceeded to the criticism of the reason, sought with the torch of self-knowledge to illuminate the dark depths of our breasts, and found in the law of conscience the resting-pole in the flight of phenomena. Again, when a Schiller sought to mitigate the harsh severity of the Kantian law by the cheerful grace of the 'beautiful soul,' in which the discord of nature and mind is reconciled with the free and noble humanity, what is this but Luther's central thought of the freedom of a Christian man, who does the good of himself without the compulsion of the law, impelled only by holy love's own compulsion? Or when a Schleiermacher has led us back from all outer forms of religion in cultus or in dogma to its mysterious source in the depths of the heart, where the soul feels itself touched by the infinite Spirit, and in dependence upon it exalted above the limits of the senses, what is this but Luther's cardinal doctrine of faith as alone the saving principle which, indeed, is the life of the soul in God?" Goethe said: "We do not at all know what we owe to Luther and the Reformation. We have been freed from the chains of mental limitation, and we have, in consequence of our growing culture, become capable of returning to the source and apprehending Christianity in its purity. We have again the courage to stand with firm feet upon God's earth and to feel conscious of our God-endowed human nature. Let mental culture continue to advance, the natural sciences grow in ever-greater breadth and depth, and the human mind be broadened as it may, it will never surpass the grandeur and ethical culture of Christianity as it shines forth in the gospels." The one thing which most surprises and mystifies us in Pfleiderer's writings is his unconsciousness of the glaring inconsistency and irreconcilable contradictions between his various and, as it seems to us, opposing views. Not a few readers will find the essay on "The National Traits of the Germans as Seen in Their Religion" the most interesting in this volume.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer. By JOHN WHITE CHADWICK. Crown 8vo, pp. 422. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, $2.

Mr. Chadwick dedicates his book to those who believe that "Religion is the most natural and significant expression of our human life." This is the third biography of Theodore Parker, and the present author has freely used the work of his predecessors, pouncing on whatever he liked best in the pages of Weiss and of Frothingham. As a piece of intellectual and literary work this is doubtless the best of the three, as, indeed, for several reasons, it should be; its later date gives it a calmer atmosphere, a truer parallax, and more correct perspective, while this author, more perfectly than the other two, mates and matches with his subject as a close-fitting glove upon a hand. Such differences as are discernible between Parker and Chadwick are rather of degree than of kind. Their ways of dealing with the Scriptures and with Jesus are much like. Yet in some things Parker is a conservative compared to the farther-gone and more reckless radical who now acts as his biographer. Parker has more passion and fire; in Chadwick there is little heat or flame—on his religious hearthstone there seems more ashes than embers. Parker's affirmations are as dogmatic and positive as his iconoclastic denials are vehement; Chadwick is scant and chary of affirmations and credos—he poises, balances, hesitates, and leaves faith's great questions unsettled—a mist of doubt blankets his landscapes and mystifies his hearers. We should expect Parker to preach to large congregations and Chadwick to small ones. The world likes a positive man who knows what he believes, and it will listen to him through whose strong and steady words rings the high note of certitude. It was of Parker that Lowell wrote:

> Every word that he speaks has been fierily furnaced
> In the blast of a life that has struggled in earnest.

Theodore Parker's intellectual gifts, we are told, came more from his father; from his mother, deep religiousness and a warm heart. What that mother was to him we catch a glimpse of in a passage which contains, no doubt, the reflection of his own experience, in which he records how the thoughts of the child go up from his earthly mother, who manages the little room he sleeps in, to the great heavenly Housekeeper who manages all the world. This, he says, is only the beginning of religion in the dawn-twilight of the young soul's life, like the voice of the bluebird and the phœbe, coming early in March, but it is the prelude to that whole summer of joyous song which will erelong gladden the procreant nest. And it was of her the grown man was thinking in the pulpit when he said to his people, "The best part of many a man's wisdom came to him when his mother laid her hand on his childish head and smoothed down his silken hair, and taught him of God, of conscience, of righteousness, and, awaking the devotion of his young

heart, bade him fly toward heaven on his half-fledged wings." The first books the farmer's lad bought he earned by picking huckleberries and taking them to Boston to sell. When he finished his course at Harvard he describes himself as "a raw boy, with rough clothes made by country tailors, coarse shoes, big hands, red lips, and blue eyes," going out to teach for fifteen dollars a month and his board. At that business, with overwork and insufficient nourishment, he sowed the seeds of long and finally fatal ill health. In Boston, for a year, he attended on Lyman Beecher's preaching, with the result of revolting utterly from his theology. The progress of Parker's ministry and the process of the gradual disintegration into rationalism of his original faith could not be more accurately or amply described than by this biographer who is himself a master-unbuilder, an expert conductor of disintegrations, a lord of demolition. If preachers should adopt one of Parker's early resolutions, to preach nothing as religion which he had not experienced inwardly and made his own so that he knew it by heart, the range of their affirmations might be narrowed, but the note of reality would be more piercing and constant. Parker was nothing if not intense. He could not abide coldness. Goethe as a man he abhorred, because there was "no warm beat out of his heart." Chadwick says that if Parker had accepted Coleridge's antithesis of natural and supernatural religion (the former meaning a religion of sensational origin and the latter a religion of intuitional origin), he would have been the most ardent supernaturalist of his time. But Parker left it for Bushnell to take up, as a useful and convenient means of getting all the salvage possible from the wreck of certain traditional beliefs. The distinction between "reason" and "understanding" Parker heartily accepted from Coleridge, who had appropriated it from the German schools. The influence of Germany upon English thought, in the thirties, was mainly through Coleridge and Carlyle. The secret of the genesis of New England Unitarianism lies open in the remark of Dr. Dewey that he preferred Rationalism to Calvinism; and it was the same recoil that made Parker write, "If this New England theology, which cramps the intellect and palsies the soul of us, does not come to the ground, then it shall be because it has more truth in it than I have ever found." He preferred no God at all to the one fashioned in the furnace-heat of Edwards's pitiless imagination or hewn by Calvin's frozen steel. It is noted that at Channing's funeral four undesirable and unsuitable persons took active part, two of his personal enemies and two others sharply antagonistic to his way of thought, while in the church porch two of the saints were heard conversing thus: "Well, Dr. Channing is gone." "Yes, and much trouble has he given us." Martineau overhauled Parker for something that looked like Pantheism and a doctrine of Inspiration that made of one kind God's immanence in matter and in man. Martineau, having been a necessarian in his youth after the manner of Priestley, was ever after almost bitter in his assault on anything bearing either a real or formal

resemblance to the doctrine of philosophical necessity or tending to deny that man, as a moral being, has "life in himself." When failing health forced Parker to seek rest and recuperation he "rested like fury" in Europe, an example of perpetual motion and intense interest. Seeing in Paris the Venus of Milo, he comments, "A *glorious human creature* made for all the events of life;" while of the one in Florence he says, "The *toy woman* came to her perfect flower in the Venus de Medici." At Pisa he sees the two towers, the lesser of which "resembles the great one only in its leaning, as is the way with all imitators—they get the halting step without the inspiration." He thinks the Roman Church cultivates feelings of reverence, of faith, of gentleness better than the Protestant Churches, but does not affect the conscience so powerfully or appeal to the reason or to practical good sense. At Tübingen Parker found Ewald regarding De Wette as too skeptical, and Baur saying, when asked how many hours a day he studied, "Alas, only eighteen!" One is not surprised to find Goethe's friend, Bettine von Arnim, calling herself not a Christian but a heathen, offering her prayers to Jupiter, and saying that Jesus Christ had done more harm in the world than anybody else—doubtless because he appears in history as the one supreme overthrower of heathenism. Parker describes the bigot as worshiping the knot hole through which a dusty beam of light has streamed in upon his darkness, the radical as declaring nothing to be good if it has been established, and the patent reformer as screaming in your ears that he can finish and perfect the world with a single touch. Theodore Parker affirmed that God, the Moral Law, and Immortality are directly known. Jacobi, from whom he took the plan of his thinking, taught that God, the Soul, and Free Will are intuitive beliefs of the mind and have the same validity as Time, Space, and the External World as postulated by the demands of sensuous perception. Kant held that the Moral Law is given in consciousness while God and Immortality are posited as intellectual forms convenient for its operation. A fine definition it is which says, "Our conscience is our consciousness of the conscience of God." Parker's hierarchy of the human faculties was ordered thus: intellect, conscience, affection, religiousness. He always insisted that without a conscious relation of the soul to God life is a poor aborted thing in comparison with its normal possibilities. Theodore Parker's ardent and powerful work in the crusade against slavery, which some consider his greatest service to mankind, may be typified in what he wrote from Europe after John Brown's daring stroke at Harper's Ferry: "Brown will die like a martyr and a saint. . . . Let the American State hang his body and the American Church damn his soul. Still the blessing of such as are ready to perish will fall on him and the universal justice of the Infinitely Perfect God will make him welcome home." In his time of failing health Parker wrote: "I am forty-seven by my mother's reckoning, but seventy-four in my feelings. Sometimes I think of knocking at Earth's door with my staff, saying, '*Liebe Mutter*, let me

in?'" Yet he wrote in another letter, "In all my illness, and it is now in its third year, I have not had a single sad hour." Nevertheless, in 1842, on the eve of his birthday, he had written in his journal: "Two-and-forty years ago my father, a hale man in his fifty-first year, was looking for the birth of another child before morning—the eleventh child. How little does the mother know of the babe she nurses at her breast! Poor, dear mother! You little knew how many a man would curse the son you painfully brought into life!" Parker had the lonesome lot of being anathema to both evangelicals and antievangelicals, to orthodox and Unitarian. The only funeral service over his remains in Florence, in May, 1860, was that an old friend read the Beatitudes. In 1866 Frances Power Cobbe began the publication of his complete works, but the fourteen volumes fell dead from the press, and still lie, we believe, in dust, unsold upon the shelves. An unemasculated Gospel is more in demand. One is surprised to find Chadwick criticising Parker and Martineau as looking for the significance of religion too rigidly to its intellectual contents, but not surprised when this Unitarian pastor publicly states that faith in immortality is diminishing in his congregation. We do not wonder; we should think it would. Just here it may not be irrelevant to note that the opinion we expressed in our last November number concerning the pernicious character of Allen's novel, *The Reign of Law*, is sustained from the opposite side by the recent statement from E. E. Hale, indorsed by J. W. Chadwick and M. J. Savage, that Allen's book is worth more to the "liberal" cause than all the sermons that "liberal" ministers have written in a twelvemonth. This we also believe, for the book is insidious and saturating, while the "liberal" pulpit is not pungent or convincing. Its preaching exhibits the futility of its gospel, which the more it is preached the less it is believed, and the fewer they be who care to hear it. Heretic fiction in Christian homes is far more dangerously potent than the "liberal" pulpit, which gets not many hearers and convinces few of them.

Supplementary History of American Methodism. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. 8vo, pp. 259. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. Price, cloth, $1.50.

This is a continuation of Dr. Stevens's abridged *History of American Methodism*, and is the last work of his fertile, diligent, and eloquent pen, having been barely finished when, in the fullness of years, our great historian passed into the heavens. His *Compendious History of American Methodism* culminated at the Centennial Jubilee in 1866, the climax of the first hundred years in this New World of the Methodistic movement, the greatest popular religious movement in history since the Reformation. The singular and increasing success of the demonstration since 1866 demanded that Dr. Stevens continue his narrative, and in this volume he has brought the record down to 1890, covering about a quarter of a century, a period filled with rich results of the labors of the preceding hundred years, a period of culminations and harvests. While

this volume is a continuation of the preceding one, it is as far as possible complete in itself; and it enables the reader to estimate comprehensively the present significance, the actual condition and prospects of the Methodist Episcopal Church throughout Christendom—throughout the earth. Its marvelous statistics are exact, authentic, and verified by official authority. The author records the fact that, during the period covered by this book, Methodism has become more than ever a movement of the people all around the world, and that this popular and universal trend denotes the sweep and speed of its coming history. And there is cheering encouragement in the fact that this veteran observer and scholar, watching the signs of the times and the drift of events, writes with almost the final strokes of his careful pen, "After more than seventy years spent in the practical as well as passive study of Methodism, I do not hesitate to believe that its greatest history can be wrought in the future, and that its prospects for the new century into which we are about to enter are such as should inspire our Church with devoutest ambition and heroic energy." Saying which, he only adds his final exhortation to his Methodist brethren, that, as their denominational form of the common Christian cause is, in its primitive simplicity and essential catholicity, best prepared for the predicted perils of Christianity in the coming century, they should more than ever be steadfast in their work, confronting the new century with unwavering courage, and marching into it and through it with united ranks and the consciousness of a universal and invincible mission; and the last message of Abel Stevens to the Church he loved and loyally served is delivered. The book before us treats first of the territorial progress of Methodism to and across the New World to the Pacific coast, building a Christian empire in Oregon, Washington, and California; then of the episcopate, lay representation, increased lay activity, progress in home and foreign missions, the work of church extension, and aid to the freedmen, women's work in the Church, education and literature, the increasing liberality and great resources of the Church, Arminianism, episcopal necrology, the presence and activity of our Church in the South, our work abroad in Africa, South America, China, Japan, Korea, Europe, and India, the two Ecumenical Conferences which Methodism has held in London and Washington. It then offers some final views on the reasons for the past, and conditions of the future, success of Methodism, and ends with an appendix containing extracts from the Episcopal Address at the General Conference of 1896, and from the sermon of Bishop Andrews at the celebration by New York Methodism, in 1897, of his twenty-five years of episcopal service. The solid history reliably recorded in this book is so wonderful and manifestly divine that only a very bilious and pessimistic saint can rise from its perusal without strong faith and confident hope for continued victories hereafter for the onward-marching Methodist columns of the army of King Jesus. On the last pages Dr. Stevens quotes, from a public lecture given in 1892

by Rev. John White Chadwick, Pastor of the Second Unitarian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., the following: "There are more Methodists to-day than there were English-speaking people in the world when Wesley entered on his great apostolate in 1739. There are nearly half as many Methodists in the world as there are people in the United States, and they are increasing in number all the time. They will grow in culture and intelligence more and more as time goes on; in knowledge of the order of nature and the spiritual history of man. If it shall be their happy fortune, growing thus and to the liveliness of their emotion adding self-control, to lose nothing of their earnestness either in matters of divine communion or of human help, imagination cannot conceive for them a more glorious Church than they shall build for worship and for work."

Huldreich Zwingli. The Reformer of German Switzerland, 1484-1531. By SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, Professor of Church History, New York University. Together with an Historical Survey of Switzerland before the Reformation, by Professor John Martin Vincent, Johns Hopkins University; and a Chapter on Zwingli's Theology, by Professor Frank Hugh Foster, University of California. 12mo, pp. xxvi-519. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price, cloth, $2.

To the extent that the Reformation shall assume more majestic proportions as time passes, an exact knowledge of its issues, leaders, and results will be increasingly necessary. The present volume, which is the fifth in the series known as "Heroes of the Reformation," has therefore a mission that entitles it to special notice. By the statement of the preface Professor Jackson was not only the projector of the entire series, but has been busy at intervals for nearly five years in the preparation of this particular biography. Avoiding both rhetorical embellishments and excessive eulogy, he easily makes apparent the results of his long and wide investigation. The Zwingli whom he depicts was hedged about by human limitations. It is, indeed, wholesome to find an author so free from the disposition to apotheosis in the portrayal of his hero. "The four years of intimate association with Zwingli which the author has enjoyed," Professor Jackson writes, "have greatly increased his respect for the man. But though Zwingli has won his high regard, he is unable, through his own inability perhaps to appreciate goodness, to value him so highly as some do. He does not put him in the front rank of the great men of the world, nor in Reformation history on equality with Luther and Calvin. His defects are patent; his literary work is so frequently marred by haste that while it served its immediate ends well it has less interest for the after world; in his treatment of the Baptists he followed only conventional lines and was prejudiced and cruel—the author is himself not a Baptist—his jealousy of Luther was a mark of weakness; in the latter part of his life he was more a politician than he should have been." Yet the professor makes a due recognition of the value of Zwingli's leadership and of his claim to a high place in history. "But on the other hand," continues the author, "he led the Reformation movement in German Switzerland, and spent his days in the service of his conception of

the truth. He was a generous, self-sacrificing, lovable character, whose politico-religious writings reveal the stalwart Swiss who could not be bribed to silence, the man who saw clearly the cause of his country's decline, but who loved his country in spite of all her faults with a passionate devotion, and for her sake laid down his life. It is as a man, as an indefatigable worker, as a broad-minded scholar, as an approved player of a large part on a small stage that the author admires Zwingli and commends him to others. Whether he was right in his theology the author does not here discuss; nor is he at all concerned to expound and defend his distinctive teachings. But he believes that if the four great Continental reformers—Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Calvin—should appear to-day, the one among them who would have to do least to adapt himself to our modern ways of thought and the man who would soonest gather an enthusiastic following would be Huldreich Zwingli, the reformer of German Switzerland." Of the incidental features of the volume it is not possible to speak in full. They include, however, a preliminary bibliography of German works, entitled "Some Indispensable Aids to the Study of Zwingli," and in extent most ample; an introductory chapter, by Professor J. M. Vincent, Ph.D., of Johns Hopkins University, giving an historical survey of the period preceding Zwingli's birth, under the title of "Switzerland at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century;" a supplementary chapter, by Professor F. H. Foster, D.D., of the Pacific Theological Seminary, which discusses "Zwingli's Theology, Philosophy, and Ethics;" and an Appendix containing "the first published defense of Zwingli's reformatory ideas" and Zwingli's Confession of Faith, both of them being translations by eminent authorities. A series of charming Swiss illustrations accompanies the text; while, to secure local coloring and to see the manuscripts of Zwingli, the author in 1897 made a special journey to the places in Switzerland associated with the reformer, and also to Marburg in Hesse. Altogether, the professor has put into a relatively small compass a biography so scholarly, full, and unprejudiced as to invite most favorable attention.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Survivals. By LEWIS V. F. RANDOLPH. 12mo, pp. 89. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price, cloth, $1.

This little volume of verse, embellished by the artistic hand of Bryson Burroughs, is made up of the responses of the soul of a man of affairs to the beauties of nature, the call of public occasions, and the inspirations of religious truth and sentiment. The author, who is president of the Atlantic Trust Company, prints in place of preface an "Apology" for this book of poetry offered by a financier. In his youth Mr. Randolph longed for a literary career, but could not afford it. When a young clerk in a bank the bank president, discovering that he wrote

verses, remarked to the cashier, "A proper enough young man, but poetry and banking don't mix;" and Randolph's innocent little verses came near costing him his clerkship and his living. Years ago when Governor Leslie M. Shaw, of Iowa, was in the banking business, he needed an assistant bookkeeper. A business man in an adjoining town wrote a strong letter recommending a certain young man. At the bottom was written, "P. S.—He plays in the band." That postscript lost the young bookkeeper his chance. The future governor reasoned, "A man can do but one thing at a time; if he has time to play in the band he hasn't time to be a first-class bookkeeper in a bank." This is worth recording for the sake of its lesson. Probably to be a first-class minister requires as much concentration, and as rigid exclusion of all side issues, as to be a first-class bookkeeper. Success can come on no other plan. Concentration means intensity, which like a red-hot electric cautery burns its way through. The public faith in the man who attends strictly to his business, and its distrust of one who turns aside, are illustrated by another story in our author's "Apology." John Mills was a banker of Lancashire, who occasionally indulged secretly in writing verses. R. W. Emerson saw some of them in manuscript and said, "Why not publish them?" "No," answered the banker, "if I published a book of poetry, there would be a run on the bank in no time." Mr. Randolph, through a life necessarily "much devoted to the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of other people's riches," has refused to spend the whole of this probationary existence wielding a muck rake, like Bunyan's old man; has cultivated the spiritual fervor and aspiration which animate and elevate his verse; and is not ashamed of cherishing poetic ideals, laying most emphasis upon the religious aspects of life, and taking a large active part in the work of the Church militant. Here is a financier whose most serious figuring has been over the problem, "What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose himself?"

The Poetry of the Psalms. By HENRY VAN DYKE, LL.D., Professor of Literature in Princeton University. 12mo, pp. 25. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co. Price, cloth, 60 cents.

This beautiful little book, printed at the Merrymount Press, with cover design by Goodhue, is for readers of the English Bible. Professor Van Dyke's introduction shows the spirit in which he has written: "There are three ways in which we may study the Bible; as a revelation, as a document, and as literature. . . . The true lover of it has an interest in all the elements of the immortal Book. He wishes to discern, and rightly to appreciate, the method of its history, the spirit of its philosophy, the power of its eloquence, and the charm of its poetry. He wishes this all the more because he finds in it something which is not in any other book; a vision of God, a hope for man, and an inspiration to righteousness which are evidently divine. As the worshiper in the temple would observe the art and structure of the carven beams of

cedar and the lily work on the tops of the pillars all the more attentively because they beautified the house of his God, so the man who has a religious faith in the Bible will study more eagerly and admiringly the literary forms of the Book in which the Holy Spirit speaks forever. We shall do well to consider appreciatively the poetical element in the Psalms. The comfort, help, and guidance that they bring to our spiritual life will not be diminished but increased by a perception of their exquisite form and finish. If a king sent a golden cup full of cheering cordial to a weary man, he might well admire the twofold bounty of the royal gift. The beauty of the vessel would make the draught more grateful and refreshing. And if the cup were inexhaustible, if it filled itself anew as often as it touched the lips, then the very shape and adornment of it would become significant and precious. It would be an inestimable possession, a singing goblet, a treasure of life." The Psalms are great with "an intense love of nature, a passionate sense of the beauty of holiness, and an exultant joy in God."

Ephesian Studies, Expository Readings on the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Ephesians. By the Rev. HANDLEY C. G. MOULE, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Fellow of St. Catherine's College, etc. 12mo, pp. 341. New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, $1.75.

For their reverent spirit, evident scholarship, and sensible exegesis these Studies are to be commended. From the Preface we learn that they complete a series of expository works upon the epistles written by Paul during his first Roman imprisonment. Of the method followed in his present work Dr. Moule writes: "As in dealing with the epistles to Philippi, Colossæ, and Philemon, so with this to Ephesus, or more properly—as we shall see—to Asia, the author has sought, as his one aim, to exhibit something of the treasures of 'edification, exhortation, and comfort' lodged for us by the inspiring Master in the wonderful work of the inspired servant. To this everything else has been subsidiary, alike the brief historical and critical introduction and the occasional grammatical discussions. The highest aim of the interpreter has been to bring the reader into closer contact with the 'celestial letter' itself, and with the mind and message of God in it."

God and the People, and Other Sermons. By DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D.D., Pastor of the Collegiate Church at Fifth Avenue and Twenty-ninth Street, New York. 12mo, pp. 350. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham. Price, cloth, $1.50.

The commendations we have pronounced upon previous volumes of Dr. Burrell's sermons might well be repeated in the present instance. Few discourses read better. They are at once honest in exegesis, vivid in the portrayal of truth, pungent in appeal, and wide in their sweep of thought. The reader is insensibly reminded of the majesty of the ministerial office, and comes to feel in their perusal that the metropolis of the New World has few more earnest preachers than Dr. Burrell.

METHODIST REVIEW.

MAY, 1901.

ART. I.—THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.

THE term "Counter-Reformation" must not be understood as implying merely a movement in opposition to the Reformation. It was largely that, beyond question, and from our Protestant point of view we can hardly do otherwise than to regard it chiefly in this light. Yet it was also a positive and very important movement of reformation and rejuvenescence within the Roman Catholic Church. It was, indeed, a definitive and determined rejection of the teachings of Luther and Calvin. It was also a rejection of the appeal to the patristic Church on which Anglicanism, although accepting the alliance of continental Protestantism, laid special and increasing weight. The Counter-Reformation resolutely maintained not merely the Catholic system at large as this, for instance, is held by the Greek Church, but the Roman Catholic system in particular as this is defined by the schoolmen, particularly by Thomas Aquinas. Still, within the limits of this system, it was a positive and very energetic movement of reform. The leaders of it, indeed, finally shrunk from pressing the full compass of the reforming propositions laid before Pope Paul III by a commission of cardinals, including even the vehemently Catholic Caraffa, afterward Paul IV.

There were various prerogatives assumed by the Roman *Curia*—for instance, the granting of dispensations of a great many kinds—which, although excessively liable to abuse, were nevertheless seen to be so inextricably interwoven with the Roman claims over the Church that to deal radically with them seemed to involve danger of shattering the whole

machinery of the central administration. Yet even these impregnable prerogatives have unquestionably been vastly restricted in their scope and reduced to the control of a caution and conscientiousness profoundly different from the wanton venality with which they were flaunted in the latter part of the Middle Ages. In the matrimonial causes of the great the Roman *Curia* seems to have retained no small share of its ancient hypocrisy and venality. Yet, speaking generally, the Roman extortionateness—especially as this was displayed after the breaking out of the Great Schism, when there were two and at last three papal courts to keep up—is a thing of the past. The expenses of the papal administration, after the Counter-Reformation gained force, were mainly met by the revenues of the ecclesiastical State, so long as this lasted, and are now chiefly dependent on voluntary contributions. The intrusion of Italians into foreign benefices has been for several centuries unknown. Whatever scandals may here and there hang about the episcopate in some of the Latin countries, especially in South America, yet the general standard of episcopal character is vastly higher than in the time of Leo X. In short, while such a self-controlled hierarchy as the Roman Catholic, cut off from the wholesome safeguards of family life, and so unevangelically dominant over the laity, must always be excessively open to abuses, yet its general tone is vastly more worthy of a Christian Church than in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Of this elevation of character the Counter-Reformation, though not the sole, may well be regarded as the immediately guiding, cause.

The fundamental character of the Reformation is that it is a repristination not of Christianity, to which both sides were equally devoted, but of apostolic Christianity in its deepest form, the Gospel of Paul. His repeated use of "my Gospel" or "our Gospel" seems to show a sense of a profound peculiarity in his preaching, exposing him to vehement attacks from Jewish believers and to occasional qualms on the part even of the twelve, and still more of James, the Lord's brother, who may be regarded, even more than Peter, as representing the Catholic conception of the Gospel as a *nova lex*, in distinction from Paul's great apprehension of it as a gratuitous commu-

nication of a spirit of life. Paul's own churches of the second generation seem already to view Christians rather as servants than as sons. The conception of good works, therefore, as a condition precedent to rewards, rather than as being, in the beautiful language of the Heidelberg Catechism, "the fruits of thankfulness," is already in the first century fast gaining ground. Catholic Christianity to this day, while not denying our adoption as children, shrinks from a free actuation of this very much as the prevailing English Christianity shrank from the cheerful filial confidence of the early Methodists.

Of course, the filial character and consciousness have their own peculiar temptations—presumption, negligence, irreverence. And we all know, though few know in its full extent, the extravagance of the language which Luther used in his rebound from the dejected servilism of the elder system. Doubtless, as Heinrich Heine says, "the sublime brutality of Brother Martin" was necessary to communicate to the Reformation a prevailing headway against the dead weight of the hierarchial Church. Vituperation is assuredly immeasurably less reprehensible than burning people alive. But, whatever advantages this unbounded intemperateness of language may have implied for the Protestant regions, there is no doubt how it must have sounded to Latin Christendom. It violated every instinct of reverence toward Christianity as it had been understood and practiced for at least fourteen hundred years; toward the immemorial hierarchy of the Church; toward that papal majesty which, even in an unworthy man, could, as Catholics held, no more lose the sacredness of its delegation from Christ than Caiaphas lost his divine delegation even by the murder of the Redeemer. To Latin Christendom, accustomed to clearly defined forms of belief, to definite and ancient religious authority, and to a rich affluence of ceremony, the surging, tossing confusion of the North seemed a sheer outbreak of uncontrollable barbarism against Christian civilization. Almost as one man the religious depth, no less than the policy and craft of Italy, and also of Spain—to say nothing of France—rose up against this threatened irruption of Gog and Magog, determined alike to enter into no compromise with the barbarian heretics, to banish alike the sensualism and the freedom

of the Renaissance, to purge away the crying abuses of the Church, to draw tight the reins of the central authority, and to encourage every form of genuine Catholic devotion, ancient or recent, to unfold its fullest capabilities. This profound determination of the Counter-Reformation, at once relentless and fervent, developed itself on one side in persecution, and on the other in rich religious fruitfulness.

The fundamental principle of the Reformation, as we know, is justification by faith alone. Does God gratuitously justify the believing soul, and is holiness the result of this antecedent justification; or does he wait for holiness, and justify on the ground of that, even though that holiness be his own work? Protestantism took the first position; Catholicism the second. Protestantism assumed a wholly unmerited act of God in justifying the sinner, who, in the consciousness of this justification, opens his soul to the divine Spirit, that justification may pass on into sanctification. Justification is the root, sanctification the fruit. The attitude of the soul is from first to last neither passive nor toilsome, but receptively active, working in the strength and joy of God, and appropriating a redemption which it can do nothing to effect. Catholicism, on the other hand, declares that "God is minded to have the fruits of his own grace become the merits of his creatures." There is here, therefore, a strong temptation to tormenting self-examination and to self-originating activity, pleasing itself in the thought of laying up claims against God. Undoubtedly the Catholic position in many approximations has largely invaded Protestantism, particularly in our day. Yet, as Dr. R. W. Dale well says, if it prevails, the whole work of the Reformation will have to be done over again. This question is not an idle speculation; it is the root of the whole spiritual life. Even the vast secular activities of Protestant lands, however adulterated with worldliness, have had their deepest spring in the spirit of filial gladness engendered by the Reformation.

At first there seemed to be hope that justification by faith alone, thus interpreted, might be accepted even by Rome. Two great cardinals—the English prince of the blood, Reginald Pole, following the Teutonic instincts of his race, and the Venetian Gaspar Contarini, imbued with the Venetian

love of the Bible—were zealous on this side. When Pole, years later, became papal legate and the last Roman Catholic archbishop of Canterbury, he was still, as Dr. Fuller says,* "an absolute Protestant on the point of justification." He used to say, "Too much cannot be taken away from man's power, nor given to God's grace." Yet, after some wavering, Rome and Trent decidedly rejected this higher doctrine of justification, and established the lower. Apparently Pole was saved only by his death from a trial for heresy.

It is true that the Lutheran doctrine was trumpeted in the extravagant and often revolting forms. How could it sound to Catholics when Luther declared that if it were possible for a man to commit adultery in faith he would not be guilty of sin? How easy to turn this into a declaration that to a believer adultery is not a sin. A disciple of Luther declared, "Good works are prejudicial to salvation." Besides, for two centuries the Reformation was deeply involved in the preposterous assumption that to be justified we must already say, "I believe myself to be justified"—an absurdity to which some schools of Protestants yet cling. Thus, multitudes of tender souls were put under a new yoke, heavier than the old. Yet from the beginning Catholicism had been averse to the free gladness of the evangelical view in itself, apart from all these caricatures of it, so that its final rejection by Trent may be said to have been predetermined from the last years of the first Christian century. Rome has always been afraid of Paul, in spite of honors rendered him. And, as Renan says, there is no Church more incapable of understanding the epistle to the Romans than the Roman Church of to-day.

The Counter-Reformation did not succeed the Renaissance without an undetermined interval. Good Pope Adrian, indeed—Leo's immediate successor, the plain, frugal Dutchman, not even speaking Italian, chosen by the bewildered cardinals in the first confusions of the Reformation because he was utterly unlike themselves and because he had been the emperor's tutor—lived too short a time to do anything. He published to all the world, as we know, the most ample acknowledgments of the unbounded corruptions which had flowed out

* *Church History*, book viii, ¶ 50.

over the Church from the Roman See. His plans of reform were most thorough and most sincere, and, could he have lived twenty years, might have given the Counter-Reformation a character far less divergent from the Reformation than it actually assumed. It is even possible, Teuton as he was, that he might have thrown the papal influence decisively on the side of Pole and Contarini, to the higher doctrine of justification. On the other hand, it is perhaps as probable that the Latin episcopate would have risen in its wrath and forced the intruding Fleming out of the sacred chair as an heresiarch in disguise. "What matters it," said the benevolent and godly man, in his epitaph, "that a man has the worthiest aims in an obstinately unworthy age?" We have given an interpretation rather than a transcript, for Adrian VI deserves it.

Clement VII, the illegitimate Medici, Leo's almost immediate successor, was, like his predecessor and cousin, deeply imbued with the sumptuousness and luxury of the Renaissance. Neither in Church nor State was his policy much more elevated than Leo's. Selfish astuteness and magnificence are essential Medicean traits, though this famous race has only produced one monster, Catherine. Yet even in Clement the mighty bulk of the papacy begins to swing about in a new direction. His personal character was blameless, his enjoyment of the religious offices profound, and his rendering of them majestic. The airs of the coming age began to breathe, although they were to be crossed by the contrary currents of more than one pontificate before the full seriousness of the Counter-Reformation was established in control. Under Clement begins that strange relation of the popes to the emperor which lasted well through the century, and whose vicissitudes were of vital service to the Reformation. As heads of the Church, the popes could not fail to be intensely eager for the suppression of the great northern revolt. The only capable instrument of this achievement was the emperor—the secular chief of Christendom, the sovereign of the great Austro-Hungarian dominion, of the Netherlands, of Spain, Sicily, Naples, and Milan, of golden Mexico and Peru, and the federal head of Germany. Yet this very greatness of his power terrified the popes. As Italian princes they were in a vise

between Naples and Milan, while even as chief pontiffs there was danger, if the emperor absolutely crushed the Protestants, that the popes would sink into mere archchaplains of a second Charles the Great. This involved a perpetual and sometimes absolutely ludicrous vacillation between eager pursuit of the Protestants by the pope and secret encouragement of them against Charles V. Humanly speaking, this wavering in the papal policy saved the Reformation, especially as being parallel to a similar fluctuation of Catholic France, which likewise rocked to and fro between her dread of the Protestants and her dread of the emperor. Even after the Hapsburgs divided into a Spanish and an Austrian line, the still subsisting family understanding kept the popes uneasy. These alienations of their policy were principally active under Charles V, before 1555, yet they can hardly be said to have altogether subsided before the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648.

Commonly, where there is a protracted struggle between two powers, it becomes most aggravated toward the end. Poor Clement VII, however, was destined to feel the reverse of this. The most terrible blow from the emperor came upon him in the sack of Rome by the imperial army, with its unspeakable horrors and its infinite spoliation, in 1527. A century of the Renaissance had filled the papal city with an untold affluence of wealth, in its most precious and delicate forms. All this disappeared in a day. The great churches, paintings, statues remained, but every form of opulence took wings. Yet, as the double sack of Alaric and Genseric had lightened Rome for the spiritual leadership of the Middle Ages, so the sack of Rome by the army of the Constable Bourbon left her less alien to the great religious revival of the Counter-Reformation.

Paul III was a mere Renaissance pope, although worthily noted for his energetic seconding of Lasbasas and the Dominicans for the protection of the Indians, forbidding the bull of Alexander VI to be interpreted in any way that should prejudice aboriginal rights. Julius III was of even more dubious reputation, and let the great interests of his office pretty much go by default. Marcellus II was a man of eminent worth and holiness, but like Virgil's Marcellus he was only shown

to the world to be taken out of it. After him the Counter-Reformation became definitely established in control, in the person of the fiery Neapolitan zealot, John Peter Caraffa, who took the name of "Paul IV." Although now seventy-nine years old, his deep-set, blazing eyes betrayed all the energy of youth. His soul was absorbed in the purpose to restore the ancient Church and destroy the Protestants. Happily he had a third passion, very much at variance with this, an invincible hatred of the Spaniards. He was deeply intent on rehabilitating the Italian Inquisition and reestablishing monastic discipline, and on reforming the Church in various ways; but the mutual antipathy between him and the emperor, and to Philip II, which he was incapable of even wishing to restrain, redounded greatly to the benefit of the Reformation. He was a most intense Catholic, but an almost equally intense Italian, and this latter passion setting him against the Spanish king, greatly baffled the hope of future Catholic victories against the Protestants in Germany. He even had the audacity to threaten that Charles and his son should be tried for heresy, a threat which the Spanish Inquisition treated with sovereign contempt. His scornful and furious answer to Elizabeth's respectful notification of her accession, in 1558, sent England away again, this time hopelessly, from the Roman chair. He is a pope to whom we, as Protestants, ought to be profoundly obliged, for although he meant not so, he has certainly done our cause great and lasting service.

Catholicism actually benefited from the fact that Paul's successor, Pius IV, was at heart a calculating, worldly man. Caraffa's furious resentments were at least the expression of a nature that had no private ends. Even his nepotism rested on a sadly miscalculating public zeal, and was abandoned as soon as it disappointed this. He was as unworldly as he was unamiable. But his boiling Neapolitan nature, like that of an earlier Neapolitan, Urban VI, who precipitated the Great Schism, was incapable of all self-restraint. His powerful personality gave a mighty impulse to the determinate victory of Catholic Puritanism over the Renaissance. Yet he wrecked the hopes of Roman Catholicism in England, and did his full part toward wrecking them in northern Germany. His

successor, Cardinal Medici of Milan—in no way related to the great Florentine princes—a cool commercial Italian of the north, was just the man to redress Caraffa's mistakes. He understood the rising spirit of religious earnestness, and promoted it without ever being really inspired by it. His cold-blooded execution of one thousand five hundred Waldenses in Calabria, although it seems to have exceeded many fold all the Italian persecutions of Caraffa, was so managed as scarcely to have made an impression on history. In Rome itself he very decidedly tempered the inquisitorial severity of his predecessor. His own want of real devoutness was largely covered by the wonderful unworldliness and sanctity of his nephew, Saint Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan.

Charles was the consummate flower of the Counter-Reformation. His intense Catholicism led him to cling still, in theory, not in practice, to the mediæval tenet that a proclaimed heretic, like a proclaimed traitor, may lawfully be killed by anyone. His Catholicism also led him to count it no waste of time when he consecrated three hundred altars in his diocese, each consecration taking up eight solid hours. On the other hand, he was embodied purity, unworldliness, heavenly-mindedness, benevolence toward all men, high and low. In the time of a great plague he wore himself out in offices of love, and died at forty-six. He was also a model of episcopal energy and wisdom, and has for the whole Roman Catholic Church permanently raised the standard of pastoral devotion. The Nonconformist monument in London worthily places his name at the head of Sunday school workers. Dr. Arthur T. Pierson's little portraiture of him is a jewel of ecclesiastical biography. His younger cousin and ultimate, though not immediate, successor in the archbishopric, Cardinal Frederic—portrayed in Manzoni's great romance, *I Promessi Sposi*—almost literally reduplicated his kinsman's episcopate, even to the great plague, and seems to have been of yet deeper piety and benevolence. Thus the elevation of the worldly Pius IV, in setting forward his nephews, seems to have opened in Italy the purest and most refreshing fountains of Catholic piety.

Constance and Basel, with their lofty and, for the former, its successful, assertions of superiority for the collective

Church over the papacy had taught Rome to hate the very name of "General Council." Yet Paul III in 1545 had yielded to Charles's peremptory urgency, and had consented to assemble one. Trent, in the Tyrol, was chosen for the locality—an imperial city, it is true, but Italian in speech and feeling. Care was taken to give the Italians a large majority over all the others together. The votes were no longer, as at Constance, by nations, but individual. The cardinals and monastic generals peculiarly attached to Rome were, even though not bishops, allowed to vote. To the papal legates was assigned a control over the proceedings hardly less stringent than at Rome in 1870. The Council, it is true, could not be persuaded to define the papal prerogatives, or even to say that the papacy is of divine right. Yet practically it was as obsequious as theoretically it remained independent. As Herzog-Plitt remarks, the Vatican Council had but little to do but to crown the work of Trent.

In doctrine Trent was obstinately hostile to Protestantism at every point. The freedom of the elder Western Church, which, content with practice, left alternate theories very much at liberty, was here narrowed down to a determinate Roman Catholic denomination. Justification was defined by only sixty prelates, not one a German. The Apocrypha were definitely canonized; the Vulgate was declared not, indeed, inspired, or exempt from errors of translation, but sufficient and final for the determination of doctrine. Primitive tradition was declared equally authoritative with Scripture. All sorts of prerogatives which the Church had practiced, including the right of forbidding priests to marry, were established on articles of faith. At not one point does there appear the slightest concession to Protestant scruples, opinions, or claims. Absolute submission or permanent excision are the only alternatives offered. The hand of Rome is seen throughout. Indulgences are very guardedly defined, and the traffic in them forbidden. Outside of Spain there has been little of it since. Purgatory is defined in very mild and general terms, but practically, in the Latin countries at least, the grossness of mediæval superstitions concerning it is hardly abated. Within these sharply defined limits, the Council of Trent was vigor-

ously reformatory. It enlarged episcopal rights against monastic encroachments; enforced episcopal and pastoral residence; provided for better training of the clergy; set on foot catechetical instruction; and passed a great many reforming edicts touching laymen, monks, nuns, priests, and bishops. It nowhere descended to the deep springs of spiritual renewal, but it provided for a wise disposal of the spiritual forces already at hand. On the other hand, it instituted a rigid censorship of books, and did its best to promote the long contest of the Roman Catholic priesthood against the mental emancipation of mankind. Accordingly, the deeper thought and research of Catholic countries have either been quenched or have inclined to actuate themselves in hostility to the Church. The doctrinal decrees of Trent, when papally ratified, were of force at once, *proprio vigore*. Disciplinary decrees, however, take effect only by publication in each country, and indeed in each diocese. Accordingly, these latter decrees of Trent have been received in very varying proportions in different regions. Yet on the whole the Tridentine legislation, modified by later popes and assumed in all papal transactions, has controlled ecclesiastical administration, and, save for its restrictions on freedom of thought, has been generally beneficial.

The great organ of the Counter-Reformation, however, was the militant Spanish institute of the Company of Jesus. Its founder, the warlike Biscayan nobleman, Ignatius Loyola, gave it this military title, not as having, like the Salvation Army, a military organization—the title "General" is a mere abridgment of "General Superior"—but because he wished its members to esteem themselves in an eminent degree the soldiers of Christ. He also exalted the military duty of obedience, not indeed to quite the height commonly assumed, but perilously near it. The order was founded at Paris in 1534, and papally confirmed in 1540. The aim of the Society of Jesus—*Societas* being a rude Latin translation of the Spanish *Compaña*—was to advance mediæval Catholicism, concentrated in the papacy, by weapons adapted to grapple with the Renaissance and with the Reformation. Therefore it has always combined fixedness and flexibility to a degree that has

made it the marvel and often the terror and the horror of the world. No association has had more genuine saints, and none more unscrupulous politicians* whose wiliness has been covered by the sacred simplicity of their colleagues. What has been said of Roman Catholicism at large is eminently true of this quintessence of it, that it is a masterpiece of God, man, and the devil. Only the eyes that are as a flame of fire will ever be able to resolve its good and its evil.

Jesuitism, casting aside all cumbersome monastic observances, debilitating austerities, and distinguishing attire, holding each member ready for any service as spiritual ruler, preacher, teacher, scholar, confessor, missionary, took at once the whole conduct of the Counter-Reformation. Ultimately favoring moral laxity, it began by breaking the yoke of moral rigorism. Highly favored by the aristocracy, it warmly pleaded the cause of the people, and had much to do with the ultimate triumphs of democracy. Intensely Catholic, Pelagianizing, and ceremonial, it was yet so deeply imbued with the new influences that the old Church under its lead renewed her conquering confidence. As Macaulay says,† by the end of the sixteenth century Catholicism was hardly safe on the shores of the Mediterranean. Before the middle of the seventeenth Protestantism was hardly safe on the shores of the Baltic. The Thirty Years' War, ending in 1648, and costing Germany half her population, and Bohemia at least two thirds of hers, put a term by mutual exhaustion to these mutual aggressions. Since then there has been in Europe generally but little fluctuation in the boundaries of the two creeds.

In Pius V, reigning from 1566 to 1572, the Counter-Reformation reached its papal culmination. He had been grand inquisitor of Rome, and had never been known to mitigate a capital sentence. Less furious than Caraffa, he was still more inexorably and searchingly severe against heresy; yet toward Catholicism he was mildness and benevolence itself. Profoundly devout and unworldly, he was personally as simple and humble as a child. Under him Rome, allowing for its so much greater population, became as gravely devout as Geneva,

* Gioberti: *Il Gesuita moderno*, tomo secondo, p. 158.

† So, in substance, in his Essay on "Ranke's History of the Popes."

and hardly less austerely moral. This character it long retained. Savonarola would have rejoiced could he have beheld the change that had passed over the Italian cities. It is not strange then that, under Pius V, Rome solemnly absolved Savonarola's memory from all taint of heresy. Pius, indeed, might almost be called a Savonarola in the papal chair—a greatly reduced Savonarola, it is true, for there was a largeness about the Florentine friar of which there are no traces in Michael Ghislieri. Pius V is the one pope since 1313 whom Rome has thought worthy of canonization. Ghislieri is the last pope that, in his bull against Queen Elizabeth, has undertaken to depose an actually reigning sovereign, and the last to excommunicate a king or queen by name. Napoleon, Victor Emmanuel, and Humbert have been merely excommunicated by inference. The bull of Pius against Elizabeth, determined but dignified, was very effective, but brought down the bolts of persecution upon the English Roman Catholics.

After the politic and temperate Gregory XIII, the reformer of the calendar, Sixtus V, from 1585 to 1590 conducted the Counter-Reformation with rude peasant energy, but with thoroughly disciplined judgment. He knew just when to advance and when to pause. He blessed the Invincible Armada that was to reconquer England, but out of the vast papal treasure would not advance a crown toward it until it should have succeeded. When it was hopelessly shattered he at least took comfort in his own prudence. The course of Roman Catholic missions in England went on, and for many years, with great results, but all serious thought of reconquering England as a nation seems to have slowly waned away.

In Germany, Catholicism led by the Jesuits and the princes reconquered Austria and most of the South, and at last, in 1618, advanced in military force against the North and against Bohemia. The latter kingdom was almost depopulated, and its Protestantism completely crushed. In the North the intervention of the Swedish hero, Gustavus Adolphus, and after his death of the French statesman, Cardinal Richelieu, finally checked the Catholic advance and left Protestantism—leaving out the Austrian provinces—with about two thirds of the population as proportions are now. Of this most fearful of

wars Archbishop Trench assigns three causes—the despotism of the Catholic princes, the intrigues of the Jesuits, the utterly loveless spirit of Protestant controversy with Rome. The third cause may well be pondered by us, much of whose popular controversy with Rome, as has been well said, breathes the very spirit of a religious war.

In Antigua, a generation back, appeared a strange disease on the cocoanut trees. They grew healthily until they reached a man's height, and were then stopped by an invincible web of blight. Even so, for all those strata of Italian and Spanish —and more or less of other—countries that were not much troubled with thinking the Counter-Reformation was a deep and lasting religious benefit. But minds and characters above mediocrity were, by no means universally, but only too generally, under its iron restraint, smitten with decay. Whether Catholicism in our day can burst these limits and, retaining its distinctiveness but losing its confining mediævalism, enter into a more generous and believing future remains to be seen.

John F. Hurst

Art. II.—THE MUSIC OF THE BIBLE.

In the days when "music, heavenly maid, was young," there were, according to one theory advanced, three stages of development. The first brought the class known as percussion instruments, consisting of drums, cymbals, and tambourines, as well as the ancient tabret. The second gave the world wind instruments—as the pipe, flute, organ, clarinet, and trumpet. The third brought the highest class, that is, such stringed instruments as the harp and violin. The piano belongs to the first and third classes.

This theory is worth considering. Percussion instruments undoubtedly came first, for it is well known that the pulsations of music affect persons of the lowest intelligence, while many of higher mental force are sometimes unable to distinguish between two very different melodies. The clapping of hands and stamping of feet probably originated this class of instruments, which could also be more easily made and played. Wind instruments would naturally come next. The wind sighing over a bed of reeds or whistling through the trees must have suggested sounds worthy to be imitated. The same reed over which the wind sighed was fashioned into the primitive pipe, and later pipes were bound together to form the Pandean pipes. The warrior loved his bow and, as he twanged its cord, was pleased with the sound and resolved to utilize it for a gentler art than war. The harp was the result. This theory may or may not be correct, but it at least furnishes us with a convenient grouping of instruments into three great classes in the order of their importance.

In general terms we may say that the Hebrews derived their music from the Egyptians, as did the Greeks and Romans. The first mention of music in the Bible is in Gen. iv, 21, where Jubal is characterized as "the father of all such as handle the harp and organ;" and thence, throughout the Scripture, there are numerous references to music, for the love of melody led the Hebrews to burst into song on any occasion of joy or sorrow. Solomon speaks of their musical instruments as "the delights of the sons of men." The birth

of a Jewish boy was celebrated with music, and when he was laid away in the sepulcher his friends and numerous hired mourners gave vent to their grief in melancholy strains, so that, literally, from the cradle to the grave the Hebrew lived in an atmosphere of music. It is recorded that four thousand musicians were employed in the temple services, while Josephus writes that later the number was raised to two hundred thousand trumpeters and forty thousand players on harps and other stringed instruments. Possibly these numbers are exaggerated, but we are at least sure that music held a wonderfully high place among this venerable people.

Mistranslations. — Unfortunately the translation of the names of instruments and of musical terms in the Bible is often erroneous. One English word is often used to indicate different Hebrew instruments which are sometimes very diverse in character and use. Among those of the percussion class we find three terms, *metziltiam*, *tziltzelim*, and *shalishim*, which are severally translated "cymbals." Among wind instruments three words, *keren*, *shophar*, and *chatzotzerah* are all translated "trumpet." The second, *shophar*, is also translated "shawm." *Keren* and *shophar* are both translated "cornet," which also translates *mena'an'im*. The "dulcimer" of Dan. iii, 5, 10, 15, should be "bagpipe." The word translated "flute" is very doubtful. "Pipe" translates three words, *chalil*, *machol*—which denotes either a percussion instrument or a smaller pipe—and *machalath*. The translation of the names of stringed instruments is even more misleading. "Harp" translates four different words, *kinnor*, *nebel*, *asor*, and *kaithros*. *Nebel*, the second, is also translated "lute," "psaltery," and "viol." The "sackbut" of Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15, was probably a small harp with a large number of strings, giving a full rich tone.

Instruments of Percussion.—Bells (Heb., *metzilloth*), it seems, were not used in a strictly musical way; yet their use so nearly approached this that it may not be profitless to give them some consideration. Their most marked use was upon the robes of the high priest, who wore seventy-two golden bells about the hem of his ephod. Their purpose, it is explained in the case of Aaron, was that "his sound shall be

heard when he goeth into the holy place before the Lord, and when he cometh out, that he die not." In Zech. xiv, 20, occurs the passage, "In that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD." The so-called "bells" were likely flat or slightly hollowed plates of brass, attached to the harness for the sake of ornament or because of the agreeable tinkling. The Authorized Version in the margin gives "bridles," it being perhaps customary to ornament bridles in that way. It is also a modern, as well as an ancient, custom for the women of Eastern countries to wear bells about their ankles.

There are two kinds of cymbals * mentioned in Psalm cl, the "loud cymbals" and the "high sounding cymbals." The difference, no doubt, was in the size of the hollow in each brass plate. The "high sounding" cymbals, being smaller and much more concave, were struck sharply together in accompaniment, as we use cymbals to-day. They were employed by the Hebrew women in their national dances.

The timbrel and the tabret † (Hebrew, *toph;* Greek, τύμπανον), instruments of Egyptian origin, were the same, and were practically no different from our tambourines. They were used very largely by the women. We read of them in Exod. xv, 20, where Miriam "took a timbrel in her hand," accompanied by the women; in Judg. xi, 34, where Jephthah's daughter "came out to meet him with timbrels and with dances;" in 1 Sam. xviii, 6, where "the women came out of all cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet king Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music;" and in Psa. lxviii, 25, where we learn that in processions "the singers went before, the players on instruments followed after," among them being "the damsels playing with timbrels." The tabret, or timbrel, was a very popular instrument at social festivities. It was used in very early times by the Syrians of Padan-aram at merrymakings. Laban said to

* Two Hebrew words are translated, "cymbals:" 1. *Metziltiam* (Greek, κύμβαλα), 1 Chron. xv, 16, 19, 28; xvi, 5, 42; xxv, 6; 2 Chron. v, 13; xxix, 25; Neh. xii, 27; Ezra iii, 10. 2. *Tziltzelim* (Greek, κύμβαλα), 2 Sam. vi, 5; Psa. cl, 5.

† 1 Sam. x, 5; 2 Sam. vi, 5; Isa. xxiv, 8; Job xxi, 12; Ezek. xxviii, 13; Jer. xxxi, 4; Psa. lxxxi, 2; cxlix, 3; cl, 4.

Jacob, "Wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and steal away from me; and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, with tabret, and with harp?" Isaiah, in an invective against the house of Israel, tells us that "the harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe,* and wine, are in their feasts;" and in another place he says that, when the judgment of the Lord falls on the land, "the mirth of tabrets ceaseth." The tabret was also a token of peace and joy. In Job xxi, 12, we read, "They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ." In Isa. xxx, 32, it is written, "And in every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him, it shall be with tabrets and harps: and in battles of shaking will he fight with it." And Jeremiah, speaking of the restoration of Israel, says, "Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel: thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry." We thus see that the tabret was also an article for feminine adornment.

The *sistrum*,† also of Egyptian origin, was used to a large extent in the same manner as the tabret, and was also employed in the temple service to notify the worshipers that the solemn moment had arrived—a purpose now served by bells. It consisted of a loop of metal attached to a handle and having loose bars which were run through the loop. It was shaken vigorously by the handle.

The Hebrew word *machol* ‡ is generally rendered "dance" in the Septuagint and the Authorized Version. The Authorized Version, however, in one marginal reference denotes "dance" as a "pipe." It was really an instrument of the percussion class, used in very early times by the Hebrews. We read of it in Exod. xv, 20, where "all the women went out after her [Miriam] with timbrels and dances," and in Jer. xxxi, 13,

* Note the expression "tabret and pipe." It seems clear that they were companion instruments.

† In 1 Sam. xviii, 6, where the women came down "to meet king Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music," the phrase "instruments of music" translates the Hebrew *shalishim*, which occurs only here in the Bible. The Revised Version in the margin gives "triangles, or three-stringed instruments." It seems probable that *sistra* are meant.

‡ Psa. xxx, 11; cxlix, 3.

where he says, "Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance." It is mentioned among the instruments of praise in Psalm cl. It is thought to have been made of metal in the form of a circle, perhaps with a row of bells around it. Women played it, and used it as an accompaniment to their singing at weddings and merrymakings. By some, however, the instrument is thought to have been a small flute used with the tabret for dancing.

Wind Instruments.—The word* translated "organ" in the Authorized Version in Gen. iv, 21; Job xxi, 12; xxx, 31, means perhaps a pipe or reed flute. Possibly it refers to a box with tubes attached, on the principle of the modern organ, and operated by a bellows. Such an instrument was known in ancient Egypt. Its greatest use was in the temple, especially in rendering the Hallel, that is, Psalms cxiii–cxviii. Some identify it with the Pandean pipes.

The Hebrew word† translated "pipe" comes from a root meaning "to bore, perforate," and hence we may conclude that it was a very simple instrument. Its wonderful popularity and adaptability lead us to the same conclusion. The oldest form was a sort of oboe made from a reed, in which the mouthpiece was at the end.‡ There were many other varieties also, some being made of bone. Isaiah speaks of the pipe in reference to lightness of heart, "as when one goeth up with a pipe to come into the mountain of the Lord, to the Mighty One of Israel." It was used at great public demonstrations. At the anointing of Solomon it is recorded that "all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them." Though perhaps not used in the temple itself, the pipe also had a prominent place in processions, it being said of these, "The singers went before, the players of instruments followed after; among them were the damsels playing with timbrels." In Psa. lxxxvii, 7, where this is alluded to, "players of instruments" should be "pipers."

* *Ugab;* Greek, ψαλμός, ὄργανον.

† *Chalil;* Greek, αὐλός. Another word translated "pipe" (*machalath;* Greek, μαγάλθ) occurs in the titles of Psalms liii and lxxxviii. It probably refers to instruments of accompaniment. Gesenius translates it "lute."

‡ 1 Kings i, 40; Isa. v, 12; xxx, 29. In Amos vi, 5, it is rendered "instruments of music."

Nor can we forget the passage, "They are like unto children sitting in the market place, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept." This little instrument served not only those who rejoiced, but those who mourned as well. Jeremiah, lamenting for Moab, cries, "Therefore mine heart shall sound for Moab like pipes, and mine heart shall sound like pipes for the men of Kir-heres: because the riches that he hath gotten are perished." It also adapted itself to the saddest and most sacred of uses—the burial rite, "And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels [literally, 'pipers;' the original is *σὐλητὰς*] and the people making a noise, he said unto them, Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth." A rabbinical rule required at least two flute players and one mourning woman in such cases.

The word (Chaldee, *mashrokitha;* Greek, *σὔριγξ*) which is translated "flute" in Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15, occurs only in these passages* from the ancient prophet, and the nature of the musical instrument named is hard to be determined. Some authorities describe it as a "double flute;" some as Pandean pipes, and some as an "organ"—with the final conclusion as to its character yet to be made.

Trumpet and Cornet.—These instruments, aside from their use on the field of battle, were employed by the priests to assemble the people and by heralds to announce the approach of a monarch, though, even as late as 59 A. D., the trumpet is spoken of in 1 Cor. xiv, 8, as distinctively a war instrument. The priests, as distinguished from the trained Levites, did not play or sing, and necessarily could use only a simple instrument; hence they very largely employed the trumpet and cornet. The sound of the trumpet was deeper and more hoarse than that of the cornet, which was high and clear, like a bugle. The primitive trumpet was the horn of a ram or chamois, as in Josh. vi, 4. That which

* These much quoted references have to do with the music of the Assyrians, rather than with that of the Hebrews. The story of Nanarus mentions one hundred and fifty female musicians, singers, and players of instruments. Among the instruments mentioned are those referred to in Daniel. Sculpture could hardly depict so large a band, but a bas-relief of a date somewhat earlier than Nebuchadnezzar's time shows twenty-six performers. The Assyrians had eight or nine different instruments. See *Egypt and Babylonia*, Rawlinson.

sounded when Moses was on Mount Sinai was a long, slender horn, turned up at the end; it was much used for stirring up religious and patriotic enthusiasm. The *chatzotzerah*,* a straight trumpet of silver ending in a bell, was that which Moses was commanded to make, and the use of which was so minutely described in Num. x, 1–10. One hundred and twenty of these were sounded at Solomon's dedication.

The *shophar*† was the instrument Gideon placed in the hands of his three hundred chosen men when he used the stratagem of the trumpets, lamps, and pitchers against the Midianites. This was also the trumpet which Ehud blew in the mountains of Ephraim. In 1 Chron. xv, 28, and Psa. xcviii, 6, it is rendered "cornet." In the version of the Book of Common Prayer it is "shawm." *Keren* (Greek, *σάλπιγξ*), in Dan. iii, is translated "cornet." It seldom occurs, and is generally called a "horn." "Cornets"‡ in 2 Sam. vi, 5, is the translation of *mena'an 'im* § (Greek, *αὐλοὶ*). The Revised Version has "castanets," marg. "*sistra*." It generally translates *keren*. The "feast of trumpets"—Lev. xxiii, 24—was a day of blowing of trumpets. The "dulcimer" of Dan. iii, 5, 10, 15, is simply a bagpipe.

Stringed Instruments.—The principal instruments of this class in use among the Hebrews were the harp and psaltery. The psaltery bore a great resemblance to the Grecian lyre. The word translated "psaltery" in Kings, Chronicles, and Psalms is "*nebel*," which is a form of the harp and will be considered later. They probably had the soprano register, for in 1 Chron. xv, 20, we read that certain Levites were appointed to sound with psalteries "on Alamoth"—the latter term meaning "in the manner of maidens," that is, "soprano."

*2 Sam. vi, 5, 15; 1 Chron. xiii, 8; 2 Chron. xv, 14; xx, 28; 2 Kings xi, 14; Psa. xcviii, 6.

† Greek, *σωφέρ*, *σάλπιγξ*, *κερατίνη*; Joel ii, 1; Psa. xlvii, 5; lxxxi, 3; xcviii, 6.

‡ 2 Chron. xv, 14; Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15; Hos. v, 8; Psa. xcviii, 6.

§ The word only occurs in this passage, and in conjunction with "cymbals," though translated "cornets" in the Authorized Version and "pipes" in the Septuagint. The Hebrew word is supposed to be derived from a root meaning "to sway to and fro," or "vibrate;" hence it is thought that the Vulgate rendering, *sistra*, is more correct, and that it was a rattle—very common in the East—consisting of an oval loop with a handle, having crossbars of metal rods, on which loose rings were threaded, jingling when shaken, like the plates of a timbrel.—*Oxford Sunday School Teacher's Bible.*

In the next verse we read that certain other Levites were appointed to sound with harps "on the Sheminith." This word means "eighth," and hence it is supposed that the octave lower is referred to. It seems that the psaltery and harp were sometimes made of fir wood, for "David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries." But Solomon "made of the algum trees terraces to the house of the Lord, and to the king's palace, and harps and psalteries for singers: and there were none such seen before in the land of Judah." The psaltery that Daniel mentions as having been played before Nebuchadnezzar's golden image in the plain of Dura should be translated "dulcimer," as the instrument there mentioned was very much like the modern zither, except that the strings, of which there were ten, were struck with a hammer or *plectrum*. It was the germ of the modern piano, the *plectrum* being an invention that is credited to Sappho, the great poetess of the Greeks.

The harp proper, being, as stated before, of lower range than the psaltery, necessarily had longer strings, and perhaps in some way corresponded to our bass viol. The general term "harp" includes three instruments. The first—the *kinnor*,* of Syrian origin—was the most ancient. It is described as a "triangular lyre, formed of two flat pieces of wood, whose ends were united with eight or nine animal strings." It was held under the left arm, and played by the fingers or with a *plectrum*. Josephus records that it had ten strings and was played with a *plectrum*, making no mention of its being played with the fingers. In 1 Sam. xvi, 23, we are distinctly told that "David took a harp, and played with his hand." This is the instrument which was hung on the willows of Babylon.

The second kind—*nebel*,† a later instrument of Phœnician

* Gen. iv, 21; Job xxi, 12; xxx, 31; Psa. cxxxvii, 2; Isa. v, 12. The word *kinnor* is thought to be Phœnician, which leads many to suppose that the instrument is of Phœnician origin. This is clearly not the case, however, for Phœnicia was not in existence for several centuries after the time of Jubal, in connection with whom the instrument is first mentioned. It may be that the name was applied to Jubal's instrument long after the times covered by the narrative.

† 1 Sam. x, 5; 2 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Chron. xiii, 8; xv, 16; xxv, 1; 2 Chron. v, 12; xxix, 25; Psa. xxxiii, 2; lxxi, 22; lvii, 8; lxxxi, 2; xcii, 3; cl, 3; Isa. v, 12; Neh. xii, 27. *Nebel* is translated "psaltery" wherever it occurs, except in Isa. v, 12; xiv, 11; Amos v, 23; vi, 5, in which places it is translated "viol."

origin—had three sides, one curved, and ten strings. This is the instrument already mentioned in connection with the psaltery. It was there stated that probably it was of the soprano register, and the fact that it was generally played with some other instrument would seem to strengthen this supposition. *Nebel* is also translated "lute" and "viol," the ancient viol being a six-stringed guitar.

A third kind of harp—the *asor*, referred to in Psa. xxxiii, 2; cxliv, 9; a smaller instrument of Assyrian origin—is mentioned only with *nebel*. Perhaps it supplied the bass, but that is very doubtful, as it was smaller in size than the *nebel*. It is more likely that it took a sort of alto part.

It is thought by some that "sackbut," * in Dan. iii, should be translated "harp." The latter word in these passages is a translation of the Chaldaic *kaithros* (compare Greek *κίθαρις*, Latin *cithara*, A. S. *cytere*, Eng. "cithern," "guitar"). This was a four-stringed lyre which was imported into the East from Greece. †

The tone of the harp was soothing in its effect; for "when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, . . . David took a harp, and played with his hand: so Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." This harp—*kinnor*—is the same as that mentioned in connection with Jubal, a thousand years before. The harp was the leading instrument of the Levitical orchestra. Certain Levites were appointed to sound with harps "on the Sheminith to excel [that is, *to lead*]." The chief harper was therefore the director. The harp, it may be observed, is the only stringed instrument mentioned in the Pentateuch.

Vocal Music.—The vocal music of the Hebrews is perhaps of more interest to us than the instrumental. The Hebrews were a nation of singers; they sang on occasions of every kind. We find that among them the singing was done almost entirely by men at first, while later it was done almost entirely by women. "Women singers," even in those early days, made trouble. The son of Sirach, in the Apocrypha, says, "Be-

* The word is the Chaldaic *sabbeca*. The sackbut was a wind instrument.

† Strabo tells us of a Greek who served in Nebuchadnezzar's army. Several like incidents incline us to the thought that Assyria may have derived her instruments in a more or less direct way from Greece.

ware of female singers, that they entice thee not with their charms." One of the earliest expressions of rejoicing was the song of Miriam, "Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously;" and, at a later time, "when David was returned from the slaughter of the Philistine, . . . the women came out of all cities of Israel, singing and dancing . . . with joy." Social festivities were enlivened with vocal music. In Gen. xxxi, 27, already referred to, Laban reproached Jacob for fleeing away without giving him an opportunity to speed the parting guest "with mirth, and with songs." Amos, in condemning the hypocritical feasts of Israel, cried out, "Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs." * The older brother of the prodigal son, "as he came and drew nigh to the house . . . heard music and dancing." † Great triumphs were celebrated with a song. The grape gatherers and laborers at the wine presses enlivened their toil with singing. A love song is found in Isa. v, 1, and Psa. xlv is a "song of loves." The marriage festivities were enlivened with singing. Music was also turned to idolatrous purposes, for Joshua heard the "noise" of them that sang and danced before Aaron's golden calf. Isaiah affords us an interesting and instructive picture in chapter xxiii, 15, 16: "After the end of seventy years shall Tyre sing as a harlot. Take a harp, go about the city, thou harlot that hast been forgotten; make sweet melody, sing many songs, that thou mayest be remembered." Amos bitterly denounces the wantonness and effeminacy of Israel—they "that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music, like David." The power of music in arousing patriotism was well understood by Jehoshaphat, who, "when he had consulted with the people, . . . appointed singers unto the Lord, and that should praise the beauty of holiness, as they went out before the army." This was the occasion when the riches of the enemy were so great that Jehoshaphat's army was three days in gathering up the spoils.

From the very earliest ages music has been the handmaid of religion. Max Müller pictures the prehistoric Aryan fam-

* Note the sarcasm in "noise." For other instances of this sarcastic use of the word, see Exod. xxxii, 18; Ezek. xxvi, 13.

† Συμφωνίας, "music;" καὶ χορῶν, "and dancing together with singing."

ilies as gathered about their altars at early morning and singing or intoning, with hands upraised, their chant to the god of the sun. This union of music and worship was peculiarly characteristic of the Hebrews.* We are told that, after David had "made him houses in the city of David, and prepared a place for the ark of God, and pitched for it a tent," he made arrangements to have the Levites carry it to its place and minister before it. His arrangements in regard to the music are then described at length, and were elaborate. Among all else he assigned a large body of musicians to each of the chief musicians, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun. The whole "number of them, with their brethren that were instructed in the songs of the Lord, even all that were cunning, was two hundred fourscore and eight." These were divided into twenty-four groups, generally of twelve each, who assumed charge of the musical part of the services in turn.

In the eighteenth year of his reign Josiah prepared a solemn passover. Great preparations were made. The king and the leading men all gave freely of their substance, that it might be a success. "And the singers the sons of Asaph were in their place, according to the commandment of David, and Asaph, and Heman, and Jeduthun the king's seer; and the porters waited at every gate; they might not depart from their service." This compulsory attendance of the musicians shows us how important their services were considered. In this instance "there was no passover like to that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet."

Women took occasional part in the temple services. In the second temple the whole congregation did not usually sing, but joined in the amen. In the Hallel they repeated the first line of each verse, and after the second line fell in with the "Hallelujah." At the dedication of the city wall Nehemiah appointed "two great companies of them that gave thanks." By many this is considered an instance of "antiphonal" singing, the first instance of "antiphonal"—more correctly "alternate"—singing seeming to be the song of Miriam's company of women in answer to the song of the men, when Exod. xv, 1, was sung by men, and verse 20 by women, in answer.

* 1 Chron. vi, 32; xv, 16, 19; xvi, 5; 2 Sam. xix, 35; Ezra ii, 65; 2 Chron. v, 13.

Another early example seems to be the singing of the women in 1 Sam. xviii, 7, where they "answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands." Alternate singing was also performed in such cases as in Psalms xxix and cxxi.

The services when "man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets," as has before been suggested, were incomplete without singing. We read that after Josiah was killed Jeremiah lamented for him, "and all the singing men and the singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations." And Amos says, "They shall call the husbandman to mourning, and such as are skillful of lamentation to wailing." Many, especially women, made a profession of mourning at funerals or other solemn occasions, and must have been very successful at inducing sadness, for Jeremiah calls for "mourning women," and adds, "Send for cunning women, that they may come: and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eyelids gush out with waters."

The Psalms.—From a musical standpoint these compositions present many features of interest. The word "psalm" (ψαλμός) has two meanings. The first is the music of a stringed instrument; the second a song sung to the accompaniment of such music. The Hebrew, *mizmor*, rendered "psalm," is prefixed to fifty-seven psalms and denotes a psalm with the accompaniment of instruments. *Shir*, meaning "a song," and either preceding or following *mizmor*, is the general term for a song. It occurs thirty times in the titles of the psalms. "Shiggaion," the title of Psalm vii, comes from a verb meaning "to wander away," and is supposed to refer to the musical setting, indicating no doubt a much freer, perhaps an agitated, style of music. The prayer of Habakkuk is "set to Shigionoth." There are fifty-five psalms to or for "the chief musician." "Selah" occurs seventy-one times in the Psalms and three times in Habakkuk. Almost all the psalms in which "Selah" appears are "for the chief musician," and no doubt were intended to be sung. If this is the case, "Selah" is clearly a musical term. The word is of so great antiquity that its meaning is lost. Hebrew tradition gives it

the meaning "forever," which has the disadvantage of not "making sense." Modern research derives the word from a root meaning "to raise." This would signify a louder accompaniment, or an interlude during a pause by the singers.

The titles of many of the psalms refer to musical setting or instruments:

"On Neginoth" (iv; vi; liv; lxvii; lxxvi) means "on stringed instruments."

"On Neginah" (lxi) means "on a stringed instrument."

"On Nehiloth" (v) means "on wind instruments," probably flutes.

"On Alamoth" (xlvi) is supposed to mean "for maidens' voices"—that is, soprano.

"On the Sheminith—that is, "eighth"—(vi; xii) no doubt means the octave lower, referring to tenor or bass.

"On Gittith" (viii; lxxxi; lxxxiv). This is a feminine adjective from Gath, and refers either to some Gittite instrument or to a Gittite song.

"To Jeduthun," or, as the Revised Version has it, "after the manner of Jeduthun" (lxii; lxxvii), probably refers to a melody composed by Jeduthun, or to some peculiarity of his in rendering the music. In the title of Psalm xxxix Jeduthun is given emphasis by the words "To the chief Musician, *even* to Jeduthun."

We find that much of the music of the temple services was adapted from the popular songs of the time, since many of the titles of the psalms are taken from the names of tunes or from the first words of songs. Psalm xxii is set to the tune *Aijeleth Shahar*, "the hind of the morning." Psalms xlv and lxix are set to *Shoshannim*, "the tune of the lilies." Psalm lx is set to *Shushan-eduth*, "the lily of testimony." Psalm lxxx is set to *Shoshannim-Eduth*, "lilies, a testimony." Psalm lvi is set to *Jonath-elem-rechokim*, "the silent dove of them afar." Psalms lvii, lix, and lxxv are set to *Al-taschith*, "Do not destroy." This is also thought to be the vintage song of Isa. lxv, 8. Psalm ix is set to *Muth-labben*, "Die for the son"—but this latter is considered doubtful.

Schools of Music.—Up to the time of David we find but few traces of a systematic cultivation of music. In the schools of the prophets which Samuel organized, music seems to have been cultivated. We are given a hint that David had "singing men and singing women" about him, for Barzillai,

when pressed to make his home with David, said, "I am this day fourscore years old: . . . can I hear any more the voice of singing men and singing women? wherefore then should thy servant be yet a burden unto my lord the king?" Solomon was also a patron of the art, saying, "I gat me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts." He was also a prolific composer, for "his songs were a thousand and five." The general conclusion from Ezra ii, 65, where he says, "There were among them two hundred singing men and singing women," seems to be that there was an equal number of each, and that they sang alternately. These singers formed a distinguished class, and were given maintenance. "It was the king's commandment concerning them, that a certain portion should be for the singers, due for every day." Cities were also assigned to them, for we read that "the priests and the Levites, . . . and the singers, . . . dwelt in their cities." We are given no information on the methods of teaching music among the Hebrews, but our biblical type of music master is Chenaniah, chief of the Levites, who "was for song" and "instructed about the song, because he was skillful."

The following table from Nelson's Bible illustrates in a clear and forceful manner the temple service of praise:

Performers.	*Instruments.*	*Function.*
Priests	Trumpet and Cornet	Processions and feasts.
Orchestra of Levites	Psaltery (Lyre or Lute)	Treble.
	Harp (or Viol)	Bass.
	Flute	Occasional use.
	Cymbals	To keep time.
Choir: Levites, Boys, Women		Ordinary and antiphonal singing.
Congregation		Amens and responses.

In the second temple a platform was occupied by an orchestra of at least twelve instruments—nine harps, two psalteries, and one cymbal. Occasionally the organ (flute) was added.

Conclusion.—The ancient Hebrews never succeeded in raising music to the standard of a real art, and, in view of the universal use they made of it, it is remarkable that there was so little development of it. Their musical instruments were

practically the same in A. D. 70, when the Romans sacked the great temple at Jerusalem, as they were in the days of Jubal. The little triangular harp of Jubal's time, the *kinnor*, suffered some change and had had several strings added. Its companion instrument, the shepherd's pipe, had developed into several subvarieties, and trumpets had been brought into use. This was the sum total of development in about fifteen hundred years.* The early music of the Hebrews is of little practical moment to this generation, but its historical interest is great. They knew and appreciated the great value of music as an expression of emotion, and in joy or sorrow tuned their hearts to a song. In their beautiful temple services they truly worshiped in "the beauty of holiness."

As for the times of the New Testament, music was then of much less moment to the Hebrews than formerly, and hence the references to musical instruments are somewhat meager and of slight interest. Even when the subject is mentioned, the allusion is not specifically to music, as "the last trump." The language of the New Testament is of course not that of the Old, and in mentioning musical instruments and kindred subjects perhaps it was not possible to find an exact Greek equivalent for the Hebrew, while the music and instruments of Palestine must have been modified by later developments in the art. At all events Hebrew music had become too cosmopolitan to afford much present interest as a special study.

* It is of interest to note that many of the master minds in music have since been of the Hebrew race.

J. H. G. Simpson

Art. III.—THE TWENTIETH CENTURY PREACHER.

The ideal preacher has been realized but once in history, and, should he appear now, would not be recognized as the man of the hour. As before, he would be "despised and rejected of men." Our purpose is simply to name a few of the distinctive features of the Gospel preacher which the nineteenth century has produced and projected into the twentieth. Nor do we mean to assert that this product is common. Every century has its anachronisms. Ghosts of the past haunt the present, and are trying to scare us into the belief that the rejuvenescence of the future can be secured only by lying in the skeleton embrace of death. Antiquated systems frequent a new age like withered hags, clad in decaying garments dripping with mold and emitting the odor of the sepulcher. The mediæval priest crosses the threshold of 1901 counting his beads, reciting his *Pater Nosters* and his *Ave Marias*, and kissing his holy relics. Scribes and Pharisees of every age come enforcing their dogmatic and ecclesiastic narrowness as the ancient truth of God and the only hope of the future. Antediluvians are here with the spirit of Cain, worshiping nature and endeavoring to recover their lost Eden by their own works. The odor of antiquity is easily mistaken for the incense of the sanctuary, and there are multitudes who fear that in turning from the past they are turning from God. The new man, the minister of the hour is a lonely soul, and can in some measure understand the profound pathos which is found in our Saviour's utterance, "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me."

A distinctive feature of the twentieth century preacher is a mind released from the thraldom of dogmatical and ecclesiastical authority. The last century has witnessed a remarkable reaction on the popular heart from the lifeless forms in which religious thought had congealed. The Augustinian theology which had dominated the greater part of Protestantism had lost its vitality. Mighty as it once was—as when it hurled "the

sovereignty of God" against the pretensions of the papacy and thus secured liberty of conscience for the individual; and, again, when under the massive genius of Edwards it swept like a rushing wind over the heart of New England—it had during the last century fossilized into a rigid system of logic, incrusted with endless definitions and exhausting polemics. Quite as dead was Arminianism in the English Church before the Wesleyan revival. It is thought by some of our best students that this form of theology was a political expedient adopted in England to differentiate the Anglican Church from the rest of Protestantism and yet not identify it with popery. The elements of truth that lay in the system could not have saved it, unless it had been disengaged from the political and sacerdotal fungi that were eating out its life.

The Oxford movement, which originally sought to recover a dying Church by a return to the sacerdotalism of Rome, was like an attempt to appease hunger with shells from which the meat had been taken. The form of religious thought—if, indeed, it can be called a form of thought—which has been so singularly fatal to the life of nations, and so feeble in the elevation of communities could not be commonly received as the bread of life. In England the reaction soon came, and its force was soon spent. Dr. Watkinson says that in many of the Romanizing churches the attendance is small, and when such churches are popular the congregations have little or no sympathy with the ideas which find expression in novel gestures and symbolism, and the innovation is endured with more or less impatience. From dead and deadening theologies the heart was sure to revolt. The prophets and conservators of this revolt were of widely diverse characters. On the one hand were men like Martineau, Maurice, Emerson, Channing, Romanes—great hearts who preferred to cross the circle of prescribed opinions and brave the perils of the outlying infinite, rather than to choke in an atmosphere thick with the dust of ages. On the other hand were men like Wesley, Bushnell, Brooks, Moody, Booth, Bruce, who believed the life could be found within that circle, if they would only go back far enough toward the center, where they would find in conscious experience the great truth which reason failed to prove.

Thus, both from within and from without the orthodox circle there has arisen a distrust of all human interpretations of divine truth.

This distrust has furthermore been strengthened by the trend of events in politics and commerce which have trampled under foot ancient traditions and have moved steadily on in the very face of priestly anathemas. The martyred heretics have proven to be the world's light bearers. The most efficient evangels have been those who were the least encumbered with metaphysical and theological systems. The most sublime characters—sages, seers, and saints—have spoken out of the most opposing schools of thought. The area of divine truth is too great for any individual to cover. The quarrels of the ages over conflicting systems have led us to suspect that we have overlooked the full significance of the commandment, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." It is a remarkable fact that while Rome seeks to save her life by affirming her infallibility Calvinism would save hers by either burying or modifying her confession. One effort is as vain as the other; for religion is not a creed but a life—a life infinite in its adaptations to every people and to every century, varied and changing in its forms according to the material and the conditions on which it works.

Theology is not Christianity, but only a form of thinking it. If it be no more than a correct form of thought, although the river of life pours into it, it is a Dead Sea in which no living thing swims. On the other hand, the true life often thrives in a wrong theological system. It is this conviction that has liberated the twentieth century preacher from the thraldom of traditional theology. We do not say that scientific theology is doomed in the world. The closing years of the nineteenth century have not witnessed, as Comte prophesied, "the utter extinction of theology and the enthronement of the *Grand Être.*" On the contrary, these years have proven to be a period of the reconstruction of theology. Its changing form does not mean decay, but unfolding life. But the very fact that it is changing proves that it is not yet perfect. Science is systematized knowledge; and, before theological or any other science is complete, it must not only have all the facts, but

must know those facts in all their causes and consequences. In short, it must be omniscient. This fact alone releases the mind of the preacher from slavish faith in the divinity of any form. Nevertheless, for us to affirm that he has no form of theology at all would be for us to deny his intelligence. Every active mind demands some intellectual shaping of the great facts of spiritual life. Nor can it rest while these facts lie in chaotic disorder. They must be systematized. But the preacher's system is not his final appeal. To make it so would be for him to claim to have exhausted the infinite, and to do for the living truth what the Pharisees did for the living Mosaism, who made their temple the sepulcher of their faith.

Another trend of the religious thought of the last fifty years which has given distinctive character to the preacher of the twentieth century is that faith should rest on historic fact, rather than on speculative theory. Hostile thinkers were alarming the Church by appealing to history. Our preachers were charged with preaching what was essentially the Gospel according to Paul, and misnaming their Paulianity Christianity. Renan said that the real danger to Christianity was not metaphysics but history. It was there that Strauss and others pitched their camp and set their guns. It was a fortunate alarm, for it led to a reexamination of the historic foundations of our faith. An appeal came to us like the voice of a prophet, "Back to Christ." There has never been a time since the apostolic age when Christ has been so earnestly and so universally studied as during the last half century. Never have so many and so able historians written the story of his life. It has been repeatedly told in the form of fiction, and poets have put it in rhythmical verse. Popular monthly magazines and weekly journals have told the old story in thoughtful and systematic order. This new study came like a fresh descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Church, and has given character to the age. It has been happily called "Johannine," which describes a more intuitive perception of the glory of Christ and a greater simplicity and depth of Christian thought and experience than characterized the Pauline or the Petrine era.

The preacher who is awake to the time has come to believe

that the one thing essential to the salvation of the century is the "Me and my words" of the gospels. He preaches Jesus —not the scholastic and the ecclesiastic caricature which has been too often thrust upon the consciences of the people and is as unlike the real Redeemer as is the painted effigy over the altar of a Romish church, but the historical Christ, his character, his work, and words. Everything, whether of thought-activity or morals, is brought to this final test for consideration and settlement. There is perhaps nothing that will explain the many excellencies of the distinctively twentieth century preacher as these two words, "Jesus only." Here lies the secret of the vitality of his ministry. It is intensely personal. The preacher believes that he is not merely to preach about Jesus, but to preach Jesus. His chief mission is not merely to present a great salvation, but a great Saviour. He cannot safely separate the thing he teaches from the Teacher. We do not question the fact that what Jesus taught is true even when separated from him. But it is truth in the abstract, beautiful as a statue and as cold and lifeless. To give a single illustration, Jesus once said, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." We all assent to it; but whose life does it influence? We go on in the old way, every man selfishly trying to save his life. It is a practical untruth. But in Jesus that truth becomes a living verity. We see him welcoming poverty, not because poverty is good, but because he would enrich the poor. We see him shortly after his transfiguration, when he might have ascended up on high, "steadfastly" setting his face "to go to Jerusalem," choosing to die that others might live. From the struggle of Gethsemane he goes calmly to the cross. Then it is that the truth incarnated glows with all the charm of life. Now, by his impersonation of it, it lives in the breast of millions who see that a life given to others is the highest life. And so of everything he taught. He embodies all in his own magnetic person. It is in the charmed circle of this personality that the preacher lives. And that calls out everything that is noble and joyful in him. It awakens slumbering endowments and brings them forth in rich thought and glad songs. It discovers to him his better self, and fills him not

only with a desire to be divine, but also with a conviction that he can be so and a determination that he will.

This vitalizing effect of a personal union with Jesus is furthered by the habitual study of his words, which the preacher believes he is called to preach. There is something in the words of Jesus which is not easy to explain, by virtue of which they flow into our lives like that river which, parting into four heads, went out of Eden to water the garden. The secret is not to be found merely in what he said, the words he spoke. Many of these in one form or another may be found hidden away in the old law or psalms or prophets or the comments of the great rabbis. Aye, some of the loftiest utterances of Jesus had been spoken by rare spirits outside of the recognized circle of faith, and centuries before he came. His mission was not to say new things, but true things. But, when he says them, they come like something new. They throb with the might of his own personality. They awaken slumbering divinity in us. Like the spirit, they "quicken." He himself explains the mystery, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Augustine says that what Jesus meant when he spoke these words was that they were the statement of spiritual truths in distinction from historical and scientific truths. But there is certainly a larger meaning than that in this strong utterance. He makes his words not merely the carrier of spiritual truth, but they bear somewhat of the very spirit that created them: "My words are spirit. It is the spirit that giveth life." His words come to the receptive soul like the breath of the Creator in Adam's nostrils. They carry not simply the thoughts of the Redeemer, but they are the bearer of his own life which he communicates to us in his utterance and so re-creates himself anew in us.

Another very characteristic feature of the last half of the nineteenth century is a strong current of materialism which has poured through the age with disastrous results. Its flotsam and jetsam are secularization of piety, despair of faith, and wreck of morals. It arose chiefly out of the stupendous discoveries which science has made in the realm of nature and the still more stupendous application of those discoveries to practical uses. Never has the world witnessed such sudden

and enormous changes in its material wealth and consequent social conditions as those that have occurred during the present age. The extravagant fictions of the Arabian imagination are the sober realities of our day. Science has discovered the Aladdin lamp and how to command its genii. Obeying the first command, "Subdue the earth," it is rapidly fulfilling the divine purpose, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet." The forces of nature have become our willing servants and are relieving us from the curse of slavish toil. The old image of our drudgery, "The shoulder to the wheel," has been changed to "Touch the button." How rich we are! The average man of to-day lives in the enjoyment of comforts of which the most luxurious princes of the centuries past did not even dream. Does he want gardens with fountains, lakes, and winding avenues? Here they are as free as the air he breathes. Does he want the breath of the hills? The chariot is at the door, drawn by the steeds of the sky. Does he want books? The library is free, his for the using. The elves of the air tell him the story of the world's yesterday while he eats his morning meal. The springs of the mountain pour their streams into his room. The lightning turns his night into day. The sun paints his pictures. The orchards, vineyards, pasture fields, and granaries of every nation lay their treasure on his table. Such is the opulence of our civilization. But material prosperity has its perils. Ascribing its progress to the intellect of man, its temptation is to deify reason and debase faith. It emphasizes the outward good, to the neglect of the inward; and earthly wealth is often the sod that lies on buried simplicity, purity, and joy. It creates a false measurement of personal worth, making success the gauge of a man. It lowers our ideals, discarding the old-fashioned notion that virtue is peerless and exalting the rich man as the noblest work of God. It carries its method into the house of the Lord. Organization passes for piety, bustling activity for holiness, generous giving for consecration, æsthetic ceremonial for worship. The pulpit becomes the platform for literary, scientific, and humorous lectures on "up-to-date themes." The kitchen, the parlor, the stage are features of the holy house.

The club invades the church. The result is a lamentable secularization of holy things, in which we fail to distinguish what is of the world and what is of God. Far be it from us to say that this has been the universal condition of things in the time of which we are writing. In some respects this age has been unparalleled in many centuries in the depth and breadth of its work for Christ. Yet there can be no question but that the nineteenth century has been troubled by the destructive sweep of a resistless cyclone of secularism.

The philosophical justification of the dominating secularization of life is materialism. Although it has been called a science, most of its tenets are hypothetical statements, rather than proven facts, and are utterly lacking in scientific classification. The inchoate cult is better called an intellectual drift. For this reason it is difficult to seize or resist. Like Laodamia, we may think we clasp a body,

> But unsubstantial form eludes our grasp.

Its basis is the ancient atomic theory which reduces the universe, including God, to the atom and motion. Spirit, soul, life, character, love are only "a heap of dust." That godlike being we call man is resolved into physiological chemistry. The crucible and the microscope explain him. Life is only matter in motion—"aquosity." Soul is no more than a vibration of the cerebral nerve, a music which has no existence aside from the strings which evoked it. It differs from the animal, not in its kind but in the measure of its nerve forces. As the sun is the giver of all kinds of force—vital and nervous, as well as mechanical and chemical—the life of the soul is the sun. Thus this modern atomist builds anew the ruined altars of Assyria. O Baal! Ideas are changes in the gray matter of the brain, their clearness and force being proportioned to the quantity of phosphorus and other chemicals it contains. Pharmacy explains the scholar. That imperial thing we call the will is but a current of electricity. Moral character ceases to exist, and ethics is simply a question of voltaic batteries. Conscience is automatism, and character a chemical product. Religion is self-delusion. The only immortality, as Moleschott states it, is that "when the body is

disintegrated its ammonia, carbonic acid, and lime serve to enrich the earth and to nourish plants, which feed other generations of men." This, then, is the sum of this high imagination of modern secularism; out of the atom we came, chemistry is our career, and our destiny is compost.

From this withering atheistic materialism there has already come a powerful rebound. The pendulum is swinging over to the other extreme of idealism, which affirms that the unseen alone is reality and the seen is only its expression. Spirit is the cause, and matter is the effect. "Spirituality" is the word of the hour. How ready the age was for this new thought is seen in the eagerness with which the hungry heart turns to the many tables on which is supposed to be spread the "hidden manna." That weird *olla podrida* of oriental religion and occidental science known as "theosophy" has had an astounding growth, and that in spite of the exposed fraud of its great prophetess. Studies in the occult are not only fascinating the intellect, but are commanding the heart's devotion. There men are erecting their altars. The followers of spiritism are numbered by the million. "Metaphysical science" has become a Church, with a membership that is phenomenal in its rapid increase and in its sweet contentment. Books on the immanence of God, psychic phenomena, and the power of silence are of a high literary grade, and are having an enormous sale. Professors in our universities are making special studies in the psychology of spirituality.

The effect of all this on the preacher of the Gospel who is sensitive to the temper of the times is to convince him that he must live in conscious personal union with God. His life is the constant inhaling of that Spirit by which originally man became a living soul. No system of thought or order of worship or mode of behavior, however correct it may be, can be a substitute for the life of God in the soul of man. The subjective features of spirituality are not easily defined. The phenomena of life within the sphere of the soul seem to belong to that class of occult themes which do not come in the category of common thought. The word "life," even in its simplest and most obvious sense, has not yet been satisfactorily defined. How, then, can we unveil this Isis who sits

enthroned in the profound depths of our being? One thing, however, is sure—spiritual life is not to be identified with any particular form of emotionalism or intellectuality or moral behavior. It interpenetrates and gives character to them all, "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." Nor is it sufficiently accurate to say that it is a life like Christ's which we attain by a laborious imitation of him. It is his very own imparted to us by his Spirit, as we impart our thought and feeling to others, enriching them without impoverishing ourselves. It is, first and chiefly, "Christ in us."

There are three features of this inner life which our century is emphasizing. The first, which distinguishes it from the spirituality of the Mystics, is that it values this outer world as the expression of the immanent God and the sphere of the soul's activity. Not in the caves of Thebais or the cells of the monastery, with their night-long vigils and wasting austerities, does the spirit of man find its divinest ideal, but where Christ found it—in the household, by the wayside, in the market place, in the scenes of recreation, or in the place of toil. The true preacher of the century is, in the right sense of the word, a man of the world, who becomes holy, not by giving up his horses, but by writing on their bridles, "Holiness unto the Lord." Though his citizenship is in heaven he cannot separate himself from this world. He enters into its politics, its education, its benevolences, its social and business relations. But in doing so he contributes in his measure toward bringing down to earth the heavenly city, the New Jerusalem.

The second feature of his spiritual life is practical morality. A word commanding attention in these latter days is "ethics." It expresses a healthful movement of religious thought. We prefer it to the more common word "morals," because it is deeper and states more accurately the true relation of conduct to religion. The Latin word *mores*, "manners," simply describes behavior. The Greek word is "character," including conduct but tracking it back to its spring. It is suggestive of the Sermon on the Mount, which lays bare the fatal defect of conduct regulated solely by rule—incomplete, delusive, slavish. True morality has its root, its liberty, its perfection in religion.

Religion is not a mere gush of pious sentiment, but a rugged principle of truth and duty. It is life that issues in conduct. Indeed, it is the act that is the final test of character. But, while that is true, Jesus has very little to say about the details of conduct. He rarely tells us in the great moralities what we shall and what we shall not do. We have often wondered why he did not speak more definitely about the great abuses, such as drunkenness, slavery, dice and other games, or the immoralities of trade. Instead of that he gave us great life principles, leaving it to the individual conscience to make the application of them to the incidents and occasions of life as they might arise. To borrow an illustration, Christ's directions are not finger posts on the roadside, which are of service only in the place where they are set up, but rather a pocket compass which rightly used and understood will give a man his bearings everywhere and always. That is life.

And that is the third feature of spirituality which our century emphasizes—liberty. We are free, not to do wrong, for that would be enslavement indeed; but, by virtue of the inner life of holiness, we are free to do the thing we wish. As Dante was told by Virgil when about to enter Paradise,

> Take thy pleasure for thy guide henceforth;
> . . . . . .
> Free and upright and sound is thy free will,
> And error were it not to do its bidding;
> Thee o'er thyself I therefore crown and miter.

Another characteristic feature of the time which has given color and tone to the preaching of the century is brotherhood. It is by no means a new idea in the world. It was dreamed by the classics; but their most extravagant dreams were hardly a hint of what the close of the nineteenth century has realized. It was clearly taught by Jesus; but the limitations of the common thought made it possible for none but the noblest minds to accept it. It staggered even such men as Peter and James. Later, the idea was debauched by becoming the battle cry of passion. Fraternity was lost in communism. But the divine idea has been spoken and emphasized during the past hundred years as never before in history; and we believe that this century is to witness a wonderful

approach toward its realization. Many and varied have been the forces which have contributed to this end. The sciences have done much. If steam and electricity have not literally annihilated space, they have certainly compressed this world and brought its parts into closer touch. The traveler makes the tour of the world now as quickly and with greater comfort than he could have traveled from Boston to San Francisco one hundred years ago. And during his journey he can pause and converse with the dear ones at home. Geographically the nations are not wide asunder. The other country is simply my neighbor's garden. Physiology and anatomy demonstrate the identity of the human species. Ethnology affirms the essential unity of the race. Philology confirms it. More and more is science assenting to St. Paul's declaration that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Amid a great variety of men, there is but one humanity. Commerce is another factor in affirming the kinship of man. However selfish it is at heart, and however conscienceless it often is in its methods, it has made it impossible for the nations to live in isolation. China is an instance in point. Commerce has proven to us how needful we are to each other. Our daily wants must needs be supplied by the gifts of all the lands. We cannot live apart. Another thing which serves this end is the spirit of exploration and colonization which possesses the heart of all the civilized nations. If it were the glory of the fifteenth century to discover continents, it is the glory of the nineteenth to explore and more fully occupy them. Livingstone, Speke, Schweinfurth, Stanley are names of our time. The ambition of nations is no longer to unfold their individual life within the limits of their own territory. Their outlook is world-wide, and expansion is their law. Many of us believe that we are in the dawn of the day which is to realize the confederation of the nations. Literature has been another factor contributing to the growth of the passion of brotherhood. All the great poems, dramas, romances breathe a spirit that is cosmopolitan. Goethe, Shakespeare, Dante, Molière, Balzac, Camoëns, Longfellow, and all the goodly company which held the pen of genius belong not alone to a nation but

to the world. In the literary Pantheon the Immortals are from every clime. The modern study of the religions of the world, wide apart as they are, also emphasizes the absolute oneness of man in his spiritual being. Everywhere he has the same sense of sin and guilt, the same premonition of penalty, the same feeling that relief is obtained only by sacrifice, the same aspiration for the divine. Wherever the Gospel of Christ has been received, it works the same sublime regeneration and holiness of heart and life as among us who have come into it by generations of culture.

The effect of all this on the preacher is to fill him with the missionary spirit. "Wise men who know the time" have learned that the very law of the Churches' life is service. The luxury of selfishness is a deadly disease like a cancerous growth, which, while it enlarges, is eating out the very life both of the individual and the community. The luxurious minister —"up-to-date" as he believes himself to be—is only the deserted shell of the chrysalis. His venerable traditions, his splendid ritual, his dignified conventions are an empty sepulcher; and the only real service we can hope from him is that he will soon give his carcass to fill it. This is not an age for the expenditure of our strength in erecting pyramids or cathedrals, but in founding libraries, schools, hospitals, asylums, dispensaries, missions, which will help a struggling people out of their poverty, ignorance, vice, and misery into that divine manhood which is their birthright. This is the temper of the time, and he is the true preacher of the age whose heart is most in tune with this spirit. Browning strikes its keynote when he says:

> The man most man, with tenderest hands,
> Works best for men, as God in Nazareth.

In closing our study of the preacher who enters this century, we cannot refrain from some denominational pride that the Methodist Episcopal Church has inherited or acquired so little to prevent our preachers from answering the highest demand of the modern world. We are not encumbered with an antiquated doctrinal system. The tenets of our faith are preached in every evangelical pulpit, and require no labored adaptation to the culture of the age. While we have an elab-

orate organism our genius is against the idolatry of any ecclesiastical form which would prevent the adjustment of our administration to every fresh requirement. Our Church originated in a hunger of soul for a genuine spiritual life; nor has it forgotten the dream of its youth. Its ideal of holiness has become the aspiration of multitudes of leading spirits outside of the sphere of the denomination. It has from the first been a Church of the people and for the people. In exceptional instances where it has attempted to pamper to a class it has had a precarious existence and found itself out of harmony with its environment. It has always been missionary, both in spirit and practice. Its very soul is evangelism, and it believes the *dictum* of its founder, "The world is my parish." Truly, the Methodist preacher who aspires to meet the requirement of the age need seek no more favorable environment than that of his own denomination.

A. H. Tuttle.

Art. IV.—AN INDICTMENT AGAINST MORMONISM.

The Mormon hierarchy was never more thoroughly united and determined than now. The term "hierarchy" is used advisedly, as will be manifest in this article. The Mormons call themselves a "Church," but they are not such in the true signification of that term. In opposing them we are not antagonizing a Church, but rather a socio-political propaganda of the most virulent and vicious type.* Multitudes of people throughout the East believed that with the entering of Utah into the sisterhood of States the offensive features of the system under review would pass away and be heard of no more. Those who were acquainted with the system by actual contact therewith felt morally certain, and did not hesitate to declare, that there was no real intention to give up any essential feature or abate one iota of zeal for its propagation. In the light of the most careful and thorough observation on the field during the past three years we unhesitatingly affirm that never before have the Mormons been so eager and determined as now in pushing their work, not merely in the far West, but in the South and East.

The influence of the Mormon hierarchy upon legislation is second only to that of the Roman hierarchy. Instead of being "a case out of court" Mormonism is one of the burning questions before both Church and State in these opening days of the twentieth century. That our readers may know more of this iniquity we present the following indictment:

First: The system had its origin in deceit and fraud. Engaged in digging a well near Palmyra, New York, in September, 1819, were Joseph Smith, Sr., and his two older boys. Loitering about in company with other idlers was Joseph Smith, Jr. The family was destitute of good name, but young Joseph was remarkable for shrewd cunning, and had won a large following among the clans. On this occasion he picked up a peculiarly shaped stone and carried it away to his wretched

* The writer knows whereof he speaks, for it was his privilege to spend two years in educational work that brought him into frequent contact with the various phases of Mormonism before Utah became a State; and his present position places him in the city which is now, and has for several years been, the chief center from which are sent out missionaries all through the vast Southland.

home with an air of great mystery. He professed to see marvelous sights by looking through this stone. The others were greatly excited. Soon he began to see great chests and kettles of gold hidden away in the earth. Men ridiculed him at first; but he persisted until men and money were forthcoming to carry on the digging. One of the conditions revealed to him by an angel was, that no one should speak during the digging. Thus early did this "first prophet of Mormonism" have "special revelations" direct from God.

Nothwithstanding the failure of seven or eight years of intermittent effort in unearthing these hidden treasures—some mishap always destroying the charm when they were just on the point of grasping them—dupes were plentiful, and the fame of these "diggings" became more than local. But this could not last always. Some new tack was necessary. During the summer of 1827 a stranger came often to Smith's house, and seemed very intimate with Joseph. At about this time the younger Smith also professed to have a wonderful vision. The angel of the Lord appeared to him, while engaged in secret prayer in the woods, and proclaimed to him that all the Churches were in error, but that to him should be revealed the true "way of life." Then there came another angel revealing to him the astonishing fact that he was to be the instrument of the "new revelation." These visions continued until he was finally commanded to go alone at a secretly fixed hour of an appointed day to a certain spot and dig out of the earth a metallic book of great antiquity and of lasting consequence to men, it being nothing less than a record in mystic letters of the long-lost tribes of Israel, which no human being but himself could see and live. To him also was given power to translate this wonderful book, which should become a supplementary Bible, or "God's newer revelation to men." At the time designated in the revelation Smith started off with every appearance of solemnity, and after some three or four hours came back with something closely wrapped in a large cloth. The tales he told about the miraculous occurrences while engaged alone in the digging rivaled anything his most superstitious listeners had ever heard. "Legions of devils," he declared, "disputed every inch of ground."

The query very naturally arises as to whence came the so-called "Book of Mormon," which was afterward published and which purports to be a translation of the golden Bible found in the hill near Smith's house. It possesses a large degree of literary merit, and entirely surpasses the powers of so illiterate a man as the pretended prophet. Taking into account the circumstances connected with the coming of the stranger to Smith's house, just previous to his wonderful "change of visions" from seeing gold to seeing a new Bible, and correlating them with other facts which it is needless to relate, the conclusion is almost inevitable that young Smith purchased from the stranger a stolen manuscript and concocted the scheme of "*finding*" the mysterious metallic book and by supernatural aid translating it. He worked faithfully many long and weary weeks, hidden away alone, translating the strange "divinely illumined" letters. When at last the translation was complete, namely, when Smith had copied such portions of the purchased manuscript as suited his purpose, and filled in such other matter as completed what he wanted to foist upon the people, dupes were found ready to accept it as divine and money was freely subscribed to publish it. As will be seen from these well-authenticated facts of history, Mormonism was conceived in deceit, born in fraud, and cradled in imposture.

Second: The first twenty years of the history of the Mormons is one of cumulative meanness and social ostracism. The reader need not long delay upon this proposition. Soon after the publication of the new and wonderful book the better class of people became disgusted with Smith's pretensions to supernatural power and threatened to see for themselves the marvelous metallic book, whereat he fled into Ontario County. There the professors of the new faith prospered for a little time; but in less than a year they became obnoxious to fair-minded men and were constrained to depart for Ohio. Mormon missionaries were sent out, full of zeal for the cause, "indued with power to speak in unknown tongues, exercise the gift of prophecy, heal the sick, and perform all manner of miracles." The same hard fate attended them in Ohio, by reason of their iniquitous practices, and in about a year Smith had a remarkable

revelation from the gods directing them to go to Missouri. There, in 1832, *The Evening and Morning Star* was established and began spreading Mormon doctrines broadcast throughout the entire region. The people became so exasperated that on July 20, 1833, they resolved upon the expulsion of the Mormons from their midst. They demanded that the *Star* office be at once closed, and that the Mormons immediately leave. The saints demurred, but the people demolished the printing office, and gave two of the leading Mormons a coat of tar and feathers. Some fled across the Missouri and some returned to Kirtland, Ohio. Here, in 1835, the first quorum of twelve apostles was ordained, one of whom was Brigham Young. The occurrence of greatest moment, however, was the finishing of the temple in March, 1836. It was constructed at a cost of forty thousand dollars, the amount being an immense outlay for one building in that day and region. The money was extorted from the faithful in various ways—largely by appealing to their love for the dead. Smith taught that it was necessary to salvation to be baptized in a Mormon temple, but that the living could be baptized for the dead. Of course they were anxious to remove their dead relatives from purgatory as soon as possible, so that willing hands hastened the work by voluntary toil and money came freely.

What was known as "The Danite Band," or the "United Brothers of Gideon," was formed and placed under the leadership of one of the apostles. This incipient army, it was confidently predicted, would one day subjugate the whole earth. They, however, possessed more the character of marauders and assassins than of good soldiers. The region was infested with burglars, and murders became exceedingly common. These "Danites" have been one of the chief instruments, during all subsequent years, for visiting sure and swift destruction upon those of their own number seeming liable to apostatize, and upon troublesome Gentiles. About this time Smith received a most wonderful revelation direct from heaven enjoining polygamy. Only the apostles and foremost elders were at first informed of this supreme revelation. It will thus be seen that although the popular thought of to-day regards Mormonism and polygamy as almost synonymous terms,

this was by no means the root whence Mormonism sprang, but an aftergrowth, having its germ in the licentious character of the founder. Soon the opposition proved too great in that region for the leaders, and a convenient revelation directed them to Nauvoo, Illinois. There their record is even darker. Smith and his brother were finally shot by the mob in the Carthage jail, whither they had been taken for safety. The twelve apostles being now supreme, a quarrel arose between the foremost two, Brigham Young and Sidney Rigdon, as to who should be president. Young proved more than a match for Rigdon, and on being recognized as the spiritual and temporal head of the Church cut off all dissenters and "delivered them over to the devil to be buffeted for a thousand years." In September, 1849, they had become established in Utah, and President Fillmore signed a bill organizing Utah Territory. Brigham Young was made governor. From that time to the present they have gone on increasing not only in numbers but in iniquity, whose stench has reached the nostrils of all the civilized peoples of the earth.

Third: Their peculiar social customs are not only so revolting as to forbid detailed description, but are rooted in their fundamental doctrines. None but those who have actually resided in those regions, coming into constant contact with the influences of their "peculiar system" and into frequent business or professional relations with it, can understand Mormonism. Let the reader be again reminded that this article speaks from personal observation. Those who visit Salt Lake City or any of the larger centers see Mormonism in company dress. Neither time nor expense is spared in case their leaders think a good impression can be made upon a representative man from the East. All the evil features are kept under cover. Their publishing houses and popular publications are freely shown, but not their secret books of doctrine. Their great houses, fitted up in superb style, having every convenience and luxury of the genuine Christian home, are thrown open with lavish hospitality. The most tactful efforts are constantly made to convince visitors that their domestic system is the sweetest and most harmonious ever known. But to see the typical Mormon habitation one must go into the smaller

towns where there are few Gentiles. There one often finds families of from two to five wives and dozens of children crowded into two or three large rooms and a loft. To even think of such herding of human beings under the sacred name of "home" is to outrage all the better instincts of our natures; to describe it fully no writer will dare.

We know no better way to let in the sunlight of truth without offense than to state a few of the fundamental doctrines of Mormonism on this subject and let the reader infer the inevitable results in actual life. No Mormon missionaries ever divulge these doctrines. They never show their sacred books when one is visiting their publishing houses. They will stoutly declare that there are no such doctrines. They are taught that to lie to a Gentile when it will help Zion is praiseworthy, and that when a Gentile tells an unwholesome truth concerning their system it will greatly aid the faithful Mormon to win celestial glory if he declares the Gentile a liar. The writer has frequently encountered their missionaries and heard them brazenly assert that he lied, when he has stated that they held such doctrines as those presented here and subsequently. But this is what we might expect from men who have been chosen for the "high and holy calling of a missionary" because of their zeal for the Church and evident faith in her doctrines including "no faith with Gentiles," as above declared. They lay down the following as three fundamental tenets: (*a*) There are a great many gods; (*b*) All the gods are polygamists; (*c*) The head of every polygamous family will in eternity come to be a god and have a celestial kingdom, the extent and glory of which will be proportionate to the number of his wives and children. Let the reader carefully note the sequence of these doctrines and draw his own conclusions as to why polygamy cannot be eradicated from this monstrous system. The children are thoroughly indoctrinated, while the proselytes from other regions are generally uneducated and readily accept the teaching of zealous catechists. Moreover, when going through the endowment house, or, in other words, being initiated into Mormonism, they are sworn to obey the priesthood in every least particular.

The orthodox Mormon fully believes that Jesus had several

wives and that he himself cannot be Christlike unless he has several. They teach that every saint who is commanded to enter into polygamy by the priesthood and refuses will be eternally damned. Many a man who loves the wife of his youth with sacred loyalty and would sacrifice every earthly consideration rather than violate the holy bond by taking another does so because not to enter into polygamy is to lose heaven. Having once launched upon the slimy sea, he is prone to take on all possible sail, to the end that his celestial glory may be very great. Thousands of faithful wives who would gladly endure every conceivable physical torture, rather than have another wife brought into the house, patiently submit in order to make sure of entering heaven, and incidentally in order that their husbands may shine as resplendent as others in the new Jerusalem.

It is almost impossible to comprehend the absoluteness of the power such a belief exerts over multitudes and how completely, together with other tenets, it holds them soul and body in a bondage of nameless misery. The following are two extracts from their authoritative deliverances: "When I trifle with the priesthood I trifle with the Almighty. I forfeit my salvation and every blessing I possess." "To me the word comes as the word of the Lord. He will come in flames of fire and will take vengeance on them that know not God and do not obey his priesthood and the power he has placed on earth."

As before indicated, it is not our purpose to say much about polygamy, but to leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. Nearly every writer and speaker dwells upon this feature of the system. So generally is this course pursued that most people have been led to think that this is about the only crime which the Mormon system fosters. But nothing could come farther short of the truth. The worst that has ever been written concerning polygamy has utterly failed to describe it as seen in practice in the smaller towns and country regions, not only in Utah but other sections; and yet lust is only one item in this bill of indictment.

Fourth: The Mormon system of extortion is more galling in many respects than that of the worst governed countries of

Europe during the Middle Ages. In those countries the rank and file were robbed under the semblance of civil law enforced by open violence. Under this system they are robbed by the hierarchy, whose mandates are enforced by secret violence and threats more terrible to the faithful than death or physical torture. By this practice of extortion the coffers of the propaganda are kept full, and at any time the president can command all the money needed to influence legislation, send out missionaries, pay the traveling expenses of the thousands they gather from the far-away East and South and even Europe, and do anything else that the interests of Mormonism demand. We are not now speaking of the "tenth," about which so much is written. They do not stop with a tenth. They often demand a fifth or a third, and woe unto the Mormon who fails to meet every demand. Sometimes by a special revelation from heaven "two thirds" is named as the Lord's share, and it must be forthcoming on pain of death.

The reader doubtless queries as to how the leaders can find out every man's income. We reply that not only is this known to the priesthood, but all his affairs besides, provided they are of sufficient importance to call for reporting. Their system of espionage is equal to, and in many particulars surpasses, that of the Jesuits in the darkest days of the Inquisition. This is a grave charge to make concerning a class of people in free America, but it is the literal truth. How do they do it? As follows: Here is a Mormon city, large or small as the case may be. It is divided unto wards, every ward is divided into districts, and over every district is placed a "teacher" so called. He is chosen on account of his faithfulness to Zion and his special fitness for the work. He is not a teacher in any true sense of the word, but a spy. He is not merely privileged but commissioned to know all the secrets of every household and of every person's affairs in his district. All the district teachers in a ward report to the ward bishop. All ward bishops report to the central bishop, who is very apt to be the mayor. Wherever Mormon majorities are sufficiently overwhelming this system is worked vigorously. Where Gentiles are numerous it is worked as fully as possible, and to the extent of their power they watch the Gentile

families also. Every teacher acts as a spur to every other one. Favoritism or negligence is next to impossible. Even zealous private individuals act as a guard upon their teachers. If any teacher fails to bring any member to book he may be degraded to the ranks, and some eager informant put in his place. Let the reader take note. This system cannot be fully and openly carried out where Gentiles are numerous. Moreover, Mormon missionaries and leaders of all grades will declare on oath that no such espionage exists anywhere. The reader is also reminded that these same leaders have solemnly sworn to uphold the priesthood in everything, and that they believe a lie either to or about a Gentile is honorable, and a help toward heaven, if the falsehood is calculated to benefit the Church.

Suppose, now, some man gets an advance in wages from a dollar to a dollar and a half per day, but continues to pay in only ten cents per day. The teacher will soon find it out and report him. He will be "warned," and perhaps a heavy money "penance" be exacted. Some wife becomes dissatisfied because her husband is planning to take another. He has been unable to convince her that the interests of his "celestial kingdom" demand the additional spiritual wife, and so he appeals to the teacher. She is warned, and if still incorrigible is reported to the ward bishop, who visits her; and if the case is one which lighter threats will not cure, she is reminded of the doctrine of blood-atonement through the operation of which her life will be taken if she persists in her opposition. In many instances such have persisted, and have been "missing;" but generally this awful threat conquers. Some poor proselyte who has listened to the smooth tales of a missionary and has come on from the East or South filled with the hope of better pay for labor and greater opportunities for advancement, assured that none of the peculiar exactions reported against the system by the "wicked Gentiles" will be put upon them, has awakened to the wretched reality and wants to get away. Her discontent becomes known to the teacher. Warning is given. Escape is almost impossible. The writer has had some bitter personal experiences in endeavoring to rescue such sufferers from an unforeseen bon-

dage worse than death. What mediæval despotism could equal this ingenious system?

Fifth: Mormonism teaches treason against the United States government. The following is the verbatim testimony given by one who had escaped from the Mormons concerning one of the oaths administered during the endowment house ceremonies:

> We were therefore sworn to cherish constant enmity toward the United States government, to do all that we could toward destroying, tearing down, or overturning that government, to renounce all allegiance, and refuse all submission. If unable to do anything ourselves toward the accomplishment of these objects, to teach it to our children from the nursery, impress it upon them from the deathbed, entail it upon them as a legacy. To make it the one leading idea and sacred duty of their lives, so that the kingdom of God and his Christ, the Mormon Church and its priesthood, might subdue all other kingdoms and fill the whole earth. Curses the most frightful and penalties the most barbarous were threatened on nonfulfillment.

Any man who has been much among the Mormons knows that from infancy their families are carefully trained in accordance with these teachings. Moreover, wherever Gentile influence does not prevent, their preachers most persistently inculcate these doctrines. The following is an utterance taken down as it was spoken by one of their foremost priests:

> God is greater than the United States, and when the government conflicts with him we will be ranged under the banner of heaven and against the government. The United States says we cannot marry more than one wife; God says different. We had no hand in the business. It was all the work of God, and his laws must be obeyed. If the United States says different, the saints cannot obey it. We do not want to rebel against the United States. Rebellion is not on the programme; but we will worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences. We want to be friendly with the United States, if the government will let us, but not a jot or a tittle of our rights will be given up to purchase it. Polygamy is a divine institution. It has been handed down direct from God. The United States cannot abolish it. No nation on earth can prevent it, nor all the nations of the earth combined.

And yet men of sturdy common sense seem to have been caught by their pretense of doing away with polygamy. Credulity gone daft! The only way to account for it is to

assume that those thus deceived have not known how thoroughly this doctrine is wrought into the very fiber of the orthodox Mormon's being. Of course they would profess to do away with it; and because it would give them a better chance to break away from all federal authority at a period later on, they would lay aside the open practice of polygamy for the present and win celestial favor by perjuring themselves for the good of Zion.

Treason is proven, but let us look again. "The kingdom of God is an order of government established by divine authority. It is the only legal government that can exist in any part of the universe. All other governments are illegal and unauthorized. Any people attempting to govern themselves by laws of their own making, and by officers of their own appointing, are in direct rebellion against the kingdom of God." This is the very essence of treason, the very core of nullification. Within the memory of most of us blood and treasure beyond all price were freely laid upon the altar of the Union. Have we so soon forgotten? Have we given the sovereign powers of statehood to a territory which is dominated by self-confessed traitors? This lust of power seems even more all-consuming among the leaders, the older hierarchy, than does the lust of the flesh.

Sixth: The Mormon hierarchy are systematic murderers, in the name of their gods and for the good of their so-called "Church." For many years it was a great mystery what became of so many of the proselytes who were known to have become dissatisfied after entering Mormondom, but of whom nothing further could ever be learned, either by old friends East or searchers on the ground. The same mystery hung about the disappearance of numerous Gentiles, who were known to have entered those regions, but from which they never emerged. In other instances they were known to have been murdered. It was no very uncommon occurrence at that time for some person to be found dead in an alley or out among the sagebrush. It was an exceedingly uncommon occurrence for even a suspect to be arrested. Many times we Gentiles were morally certain that the Mormon leaders knew all about who did the bloody work, but we were powerless

where the mayor, aldermen, policemen, and, in fact, nearly all officers were Mormons. Such murders are seldom ever heard of by the outside world. The mystery was, however, dispelled when it was discovered that one of the sacred doctrines of Mormonism is that of blood-atonement, whereby this horrible practice of murder is provided for. We quote enough of it to show the reader what it is:

> There are sins that can be atoned for by an offering as in ancient days, and there are sins that must be atoned for by the blood of man. All mankind love themselves, and let those principles be known by an individual and he would be glad to have his blood shed. This would be loving ourselves unto an eternal exaltation. Will you love your brothers or sisters likewise, when they have a sin that cannot be atoned for without the shedding of their blood? That is what Jesus meant. That is the way to love mankind. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help him. If he wishes salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood upon the ground in order that he be saved, spill it. . . . Did not Moses kill an Egyptian and put him under the sand, and have not we, the only people of God, just as good a right to kill a Babylonian and put him under the sod if the interests of Zion demand it?

Now with these teachings before him, let the reader call to mind the system of espionage above detailed, and he may be able to form some conception of the power of the Mormon hierarchy over both the persons and property of their subjects. He will also see how easily any obnoxious Gentile can be gotten out of the way. Let the mayor of the city or the president of the village be a Mormon priest, as is very commonly the case, and let the aldermen or the members of the village board be leading preachers, as they are almost certain to be in the smaller towns. Under these conditions the policemen or constables or sheriffs are sure to be true and tried Mormons. A teacher has given warning to some dissatisfied wife, but she has not heeded the admonition. The ward bishop has visited her, but still she gives signs of apostatizing. A council is held, and it is decided that she shall be blood-atoned, in order to save her soul. If there are but few Gentiles in the town or city, not much secrecy is observed. Almost any man may be commissioned to do the deed. But, if Gentiles are numerous, some Danite, policeman, or constable is

detailed to shed her blood. In due time it is done. There is no escape. From highest official to sacred executioner every man has done his sworn duty. The blood of the slain is upon all of them, but such blood only makes illustrious crowns and extensive dominion in the New Jerusalem more certain for the perpetrators. A Gentile is thought to be undermining the faith of his Mormon neighbors or in some way to be inimical to Zion. As before stated, the teacher who has charge of the district within which he resides has an eye upon him. Report is made. A more careful watch is instituted. If suspicions are confirmed, the same proceedings are entered into as in the former case, only much more cautiously, and in process of time that Gentile "bites the dust." His death is shrouded in the darkest mystery, and if any trouble is feared from the Gentiles large rewards are offered by the Mormons for the arrest and conviction of the murderer. As a matter of course he is never found.

These are not supposititious cases. Hundreds of such murders—"legalized killings"—have occurred. We mean just that. By actual count hundreds of them, where the neighbors or friends were entirely convinced that they were committed in the name of one of Mormonism's most sacred doctrines. But to undertake to prove it would be to jeopardize their own lives, while even if the most absolute proof could be furnished no jury could be found to convict. We might give numerous instances of the working of this bloody doctrine, from the waylaying of an innocent prospector, who seemed likely to encroach upon the claims of the saints, to that of one of the most beautiful wives of a leading missionary who had shown signs of insubordination during his absence; for any man who lives among the Mormons, and keeps eyes and ears open, will come to know that they visit these judgments upon all classes, as the interests of the system seem to demand. But we turn with horror from even the contemplation of such sickening crimes, feeling that every count in our indictment against Mormonism has been fully sustained.

Art. V.—MISCELLANEOUS PROTESTANT BLUNDERS.

This paper, as its name implies, is meant to be a hodge-podge. We have already dealt with the central Protestant error respecting the Church of Rome, namely, that the pope is supposed capable, by his mere arbitrary act, not only of putting a man out of the Church, but, by this mere fact, out of a state of salvation. This error perhaps turns the whole Roman Catholic system of doctrine more thoroughly topsy-turvy than any other, as it is almost the worst of all in its influence on Protestant feeling. There is left, however, an infinity of prevalent blunders.

Roman Catholic theology is so vast and so widely ramified a system that—distinct as are its great lines and forming principles—it is hardly within mortal power to master it wholly. A learned divine, to whom the writer once remarked that, so far as he could see, almost no one could draw the line with perfect certainty in his Church between dogma and opinion, laughingly rejoined, "You might have left out the 'almost.'" It is really amusing to see with what calm confidence writers of opposite schools will say of some proposition, "This is of faith," when other men of equal learning and standing will declare it to be mere opinion, and perhaps ill-founded at that. Indeed, the learned Recollet friar Chrismann complains bitterly of such arrogance, which especially distinguishes what Newman calls "an aggressive and insolent faction." We shall therefore try to treat nothing as a blunder which does not run against the main current of Roman Catholic teaching, as this may be ascertained out of any familiar Theology or tolerably extended Catechism.

To begin with what is first in our mind—a blunder fundamental but not in the least complicated with ill will—Dr. Charles A. Briggs, in the *New World* for June, 1897, says this, "The Roman Church does not recognize the validity of any orders but her own." The writer could hardly believe his own eyes when he first saw this quoted in the *Sacred Heart Review*, and does not wonder that the editor uttered a loud exclamation of astonishment. A reference to any Theol-

ogy, or to the *Catholic Dictionary*, or to Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* would have shown the author that Rome acknowledges unhesitatingly the validity of orders in the Greek Church, the Armenian, the Nestorian, the Jacobite, the Coptic, and has never seriously questioned that of the Church of Utrecht, which, indeed, the pope officially describes as "certain schismatical bishops," thus owning the reality of their episcopate. He does not call the Anglicans bishops of any sort, we believe. Rome requires for valid order only unbroken succession, sufficiency of rite, and sacramental intention. Jurisdiction is needful for its regularity, but not for its validity. Say Wetzer and Welte, "We do not question Anglican orders because they are heretical, or because they are schismatical, or because they are excommunicate, but because they come through a broken succession, and are transmitted by insufficient rites." The pope, in the *Apostolicæ curæ*, lays out his whole strength—we should rather say his whole weakness—on the latter point. He assumes, provisionally, Barlow's previous consecration, and, arguing on this assumption, signifies that even if Barlow were heretical as to orders the Edwardine ordinal, if explicit in a Catholic intention, might perhaps be owned as coercing the consecrators into a valid transmission of the episcopal and sacerdotal character. That the whole question has been settled negatively by the secession of England from Rome is something which has never entered any instructed Catholic head. As the *Catholic Dictionary* says, in the Middle Ages invalidity and irregularity were continually confused, but since the Great Schism, St. Augustine's doctrine, always maintained by the great teachers of the Western Church, has been fully reestablished, namely, that neither heresy nor schism invalidates order, if only it has unbroken succession, adequate ritual, and ecclesiastical intention. Nay, Pope Leo seems to intimate that the last may possibly be dispensable, provided the ritual is so thoroughly explicit as to secure what theologians and the pope himself call "external intention."

To make the matter worse, the Roman doctors—though not all Roman Catholic doctors—ascribe to the Eastern Church, as Döllinger points out, not merely true order, but the power of

the keys, or spiritual jurisdiction. This implies a true mission, from lawful superiors. The whole matter was thus summed up to the writer by his friend, the late Bishop Richard Gilmour, of Cleveland, an Ultramontane of the Ultramontanes: "We own the Greek, Monophysite, Nestorian, and Old Catholic Churches as having true orders. We own the Greek, Monophysite, and Nestorian Churches as having jurisdiction. We own the Anglican Church neither as having true orders nor jurisdiction." The same author, in the same paper, says, speaking of the Roman view of the English, the Scottish, and the Lutheran Churches, "They have no valid ministry, no valid sacraments." This seems to treat the latter defect as involved in the former, which is true of five sacraments, but not of the other two. Baptism has no dependence on order, and marriage only a contingent dependence. Rome teaches, not, as often said, that lay baptism is sometimes valid, but that it is always valid. Indeed, her claim to jurisdiction over us rests on this teaching. To the question, Who is the minister of baptism? Catholic theology answers, "Any human being possessed of reason"—"*quilibet homo compos rationis.*" It only requires the application of natural water, actually flowing on the head, in the triune name, "with the intention of administering the rite known among Christians as baptism." It is equally valid, though not equally regular, administered in sickness or health, by priest or layman, man or woman, Catholic or heretic, Jew, Moslem, or pagan. As to marriage Trent solemnly anathematizes any who shall maintain that the ministration of a priest is intrinsically necessary to a valid Christian marriage. And as Rome has always refused to apply the *Lex Clandestinitatis* to Lower Germany and Saxony, Scandinavia, Great Britain, or the Protestant world generally, and by the very terms of this law is restrained from imposing it on them as a body, it follows that all baptized members of these Churches are, as Pope Pius VII expressly says, capable by virtue of their own rites, of contracting valid and indissoluble marriages, which being such, says Pius IX, are *eo ipso* sacramental. All these Protestant Churches, therefore—not speaking of stray offshoots—may, according to Rome, enjoy the fundamental sacrament of ecclesiastical and that of social life.

The other five sacraments, of course, depending on a valid priesthood, are held to be out of their reach.

An eminent author says elsewhere, together with another who in this department is far more eminent than he, "Rome teaches that grace is only given through the sacraments." If they had said, "Rome teaches that grace is principally given through the sacraments," it would have been true. But to say "only" is very wide of the mark. Without baptism no other sacrament, it is taught, can be validly received. "Baptism is the door of the sacraments." Yet grace can be received without baptism, and therefore without any sacrament. The proposition, "Grace is not given out of the Church," has been solemnly condemned by Rome. Nor can it be said that grace may be given to a baptized heretic or schismatic, living in good faith, but not to a Quaker, and still less to a Jew, Moslem, or a pagan. The bull *Unigenitus* knows no such limitation, nor does its now prevailing interpretation. A Roman Catholic is not held bound to say that grace is in fact given to any particular Quaker, Jew, Moslem, or pagan; but if he says that it may not be, or would, as concerns personal sanctification, limit it in form, measure, or effect, he restricts what the *Unigenitus* gives no warrant for restricting. The Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, while still a Roman Catholic, seems therefore to have been not without warrant in questioning the liberty of a Catholic to put any limit whatever to the possibilities of divine grace outside of the sacraments. Indeed, what Clement XI expressed negatively Pius IX has expressed positively, with emphatic distinctness. Says he, in his encyclical to the bishops of Italy, under date of August 10, 1863:

> We and you know that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most holy religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law, and its precepts, which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life.

We use Cardinal Newman's translation. This authoritative declaration, addressed to the bishops of the central Catholic nation, and evidently intended *urbi et orbi*, plainly teaches—probably not *ex cathedra*, but in absolute consonance with

present theological consent—that the grace of eternal salvation itself may be rationally viewed as by no means confined within the visible limits of Christianity or of the Christian sacraments.

Within the pale of baptism, again, it is not taught that grace is only given through the sacraments. Indeed, it would be preposterous to say that grace without baptism may even bring a man to eternal life, but that if once baptized he could receive the divine spirit only through the sacraments. This would be to say that God is less bounteous within his Church than without. Theology, moreover, ratified by Trent, ascribes justifying efficacy to perfect contrition and "the ardent desire" of baptism or penance—*votum sacramenti*—where the outer rite may not be had. Moreover, Trent distinguishes the sacramental reception of the Eucharist, the spiritual reception, and the spiritual and sacramental, and ascribes to the last two the same benefit, though presumably in unequal measure. And, say the theologians, while the Eucharist sacramentally can by a layman only be received at most once a day, it can be received spiritually whenever his pious affections are turned toward it, and thus may as a continuing benefit become the vehicle of far greater grace than by the outer reception.

Preaching is not a sacrament, nor even a sacramental. Yet the orthodox bishop Massillon has an essay entitled "Preaching a Greater Mystery than the Eucharist." In the thirteenth century Saint Louis IX contended against his weaker brother-in-law, our Henry III, that to hear preaching may be more edifying than even to hear the mass. How absolutely inconsistent this view of the canonized king is with the notion that grace is only given through the sacraments! Moreover, it is taught that each increment of grace well used merits more grace, and so in rising measure, by a sort of spiritual compound interest. Thus every internal movement of purity, devotion, benevolence, and every external good work proceeding from it is at once an expression and a channel of grace. The initial point and the principal sustaining force, it is true, are commonly found in the sacraments, yet the chief increments of grace may be received extrasacramentally. And, as we have seen, it is held to be

probable that in some cases—the Jesuits would rather say many cases—grace from initial justification to final glorification has been received altogether outside of the sacraments. As Cardinal Bellarmine says, "God is not limited by our merits, nor by his sacraments." And, as a Jesuit missionary in Japan said to the Rev. Edward A. Lawrence, who asked him whether certain infant baptisms administered in the wrong form were valid, "No, the Church must have her rules; but then God is very much kinder than the Church." This is both the teaching and tone of modern Roman Catholic theology, beginning indeed in special fullness about 1650 among the Jesuits, but swollen by a constantly augmenting and now universal current of theological consent, and at last solemnly ratified by pontifical authority.

A most curious and ludicrously blundering use has been made of this false statement as to grace and the sacraments. We have seen in more than one Protestant magazine a picture of two towers, one inscribed "Romanism," one "Buddhism." Each is represented as built of large blocks, inscribed in each "Monasticism," "Processions," "Asceticism," "Rosaries," and so on. One block is labeled in each, "Grace only through Sacraments," the object, of course, being to show that Roman Catholicism and Buddhism are essentially the same thing. For so pious a purpose, of course, the ingenious artist does not allow himself to be stopped by the fact that Catholicism does not teach that grace is only given through the sacraments, and that Buddhism has no place for either grace or sacraments. Grace is a divine power given in the soul to help it toward God, and a sacrament, in Catholic doctrine, is a visible sign and channel of grace which, to a soul not in mortal sin, infallibly produces its effect. Buddhism, knowing nothing of God, and denying the reality of the soul, can have, of course, no room for either sacraments or grace. Another Protestant, equally desirous of identifying Catholicism and Buddhism, but standing in awe of Max Müller's remark that Christianity is in principle the direct antipodes of Buddhism, compromises between his malice and his knowledge by saying "Romanism and Buddhism are almost identical except in doctrine," which is like saying, "William and Henry are almost precisely the

same sort of men, except in character." It is usually thought that when two men or two systems differ fundamentally in character and principles all outer resemblances, however curious and striking, are of the least possible account. Whether Tibetan Buddhism borrowed its outward garb and various particulars of discipline from Catholicism or Nestorianism, or Catholicism from Buddhism, or both from Mithraism, or whether a common humanity has expressed itself in similar ways in all are very interesting and curious questions, but as far as possible from being fundamental. We have borrowed church bells from the Buddhists, but we are not therefore Buddhists. If the Catholics have borrowed rosaries from them, it is a heathenish borrowing, but it does not make them Buddhists. Such a mode of reasoning is abominable.

We have said that almost the worst effect is produced on Protestant feeling by the assumption that every Roman Catholic is supposed to hold his salvation at the will of the pope and therefore is bound, if he would escape hell, to obey every command of the pope. However, there is one popular falsehood that works more malignantly still, that strikes domestic honor in the center, and conveys an insult

> That turns the coward's heart to steel, the sluggard's blood to flame.

It is repeated from one pulpit or Church paper to another that the pope has declared all Protestant marriages to be mere "filthy concubinages." The obstinacy with which this calumny is reiterated is beyond belief. Thus a noted clergyman, subsequently for a number of years a leading pastor of Boston, being reminded that the Council of Trent solemnly anathematizes those who declare that there cannot be true Christian marriage without a priest, was capable of answering that he did not know what the Council of Trent might have said, but he did know that Pius IX had declared so. This is as if a man, undertaking to explain our federal jurisprudence, and being reminded that some position of his is flat against the Constitution, should answer that he does not know what the Constitution says, but he does know what Congress has enacted, as if a congressional statute signified anything against the Constitution. Now Trent bears to modern Roman Cath-

olicism essentially the relation which the Constitution bears to federal legislation. Even its disciplinary decrees, where once published in a diocese, are imprescriptible, and can be voided only by a papal derogation, which is granted with much reserve and is never to be presumed. Its doctrinal decrees are irrevocable, and their anathemas strike every baptized person who contradicts them. Had Pius IX contradicted this anathema of Trent, it would simply have swept him out of his seat and joined him to the ignominy of his anathematized predecessor Honorius. In reality, instead of contradicting it, he completes it. The Council requires every Catholic to own that, where the *Lex Clandestinitatis* is not in force—that is, in most Protestant countries—even an unwitnessed nonsacerdotal marriage, Christianly intended, is valid. Pius IX goes further, and expects him to admit not only that it is valid but that it is sacramental. He sweeps out of court, as no longer tenable, the doctrine that the priest is the minister of the sacrament, and will only allow him, for Catholics in Catholic countries, to be a necessary public witness of the contract. Yet these foolish people who are so eager to stir up bad blood between the two religions—as if there were not enough of it already—blunderingly confound "sacramental" with "sacerdotal," and so make the pope say the exact opposite of what he has really said.

The phrase "filthy concubinages"—which is used by Pius IX in his allocution of September 27, 1852, concerning New Granada, and also subsequently concerning Italy, soon after the introduction of civil marriage into those countries—has not only no reference to Protestant marriages, but none to those of Roman Catholics born and resident in Protestant countries. The pope is simply contending that where Catholics, knowing that in the Catholic regions the Church declares a marriage void which is not contracted before the pastor or his deputy, contract it only before a magistrate, it can only be because they wish to evade Christian obligations and under the name of marriage to enter really into a mere concubinage dissoluble at pleasure. With a few very restricted exceptions this requirement of Trent has never been applied to Protestants, or to Roman Catholics native in and resident of Protestant

countries. The pope, therefore, not only has no reference here to either, but he cannot have had. There are, indeed, Protestant marriages which the prevailing Roman schools must regard as void, but which they are very far from treating as "filthy concubinages." Thus, if two baptized Protestants have the same great-great-grandparent, or are related by marriage within this degree, or are godparent and godchild, in all these cases a marriage between them, being undispensed, is regarded by almost all Roman Catholic divines as null. Yet they never call a marriage agreeable to natural morality "a filthy concubinage," if contracted in good faith. On the contrary, the canon law declares the offspring of all such marriages legitimate. There is only too much uncertainty in the application of this principle, but the principle itself stands firm. No one is so unreasonable as to imagine that Protestants are to be expected to suppose it necessary to apply to Rome or her delegates for a dispensation in such cases, of which they are commonly ignorant, which, moreover, could not easily be granted to them if they did ask for it. Such marriages are held as abstractly null, but not as impugning the moral purity of those who contract them, or as prejudicing the rights of their children. Practically, they are regarded as legally and socially valid, though sacramentally void. Even where an invalid marriage has been contracted in good faith on one side only, as apparently by Agnes of Meran in marrying King Philip Augustus, no difficulty has been made as to declaring the children legitimate. The vast majority of marriages between baptized Protestants, however, have been by innumerable decisions of Rome, resting on the express command of the Council of Trent, pronounced valid, sacramental, and indissoluble. Indeed, so jealous is the holy see of prejudicing this validity that where the Protestant husband or wife of a now Catholic wife or husband has been baptized—but with a doubt remaining as to the value of the baptism, while there is no doubt on the other side—Rome directs that the decision shall always be for validity *in ordine ad matrimonium*. Therefore, if the Protestant, becoming a Roman Catholic, is then provisionally rebaptized, a renewal of conjugal consent is not required nor encouraged.

We admire the genius which packs a great deal of truth into a few words; and we ought, after a sort, to admire the genius which packs a great deal of falsehood into a few words. There is one statement of fourteen words, from a noted preacher, late of Boston, which contains as many falsehoods, and has done as much mischief as ought to satisfy the ambition of any mischief-maker living or dead. It is this, "Rome pronounces null and void every marriage not declared by one of her priests." Let us enucleate the misstatements of this brief proposition. And first, Rome, through Innocent III, confirmed by unbroken previous and following consent, declares all marriages of pagans, Jews, Moslems, not contradicting Christian morality, even though diverging from the positive law of the Church, true marriages and, so long as both parties remain unbaptized, indissoluble. Secondly, in every region which has been Protestant since 1563, and in its Protestant colonies, all Christianly intended marriages of baptized Protestants are declared valid and sacramental. Thirdly, in a great part of the Roman Catholic world, nonsacerdotal marriages between Catholics and baptized Protestants, not contracted in fraud of possible offspring, and therefore not a mere cover for unfruitful sensuality, have been papally declared valid and sacramental. Fourthly, in almost all Protestant regions nonclerical marriages between native and resident Roman Catholics are declared by Rome punishable indeed, but valid and obligatory. The only notable exception to this is the once Catholic belt extending from the west line of Georgia through to the Pacific. Here, for Roman Catholics, the *Lex Clandestinitatis* binds. Fifthly, where, as in France, a Protestant minority had their own system organized before the law of Trent was proclaimed, their marriages are allowed to be valid. This explains why, when the French government receded from its long disavowal of these marriages, the bishops gave Louis XVI thanks for restoring the Protestants to their rights. Sixthly, in Malta, where the *Lex Clandestinitatis* remains by treaty with the Knights of St. John a part of the civil code, the pope has granted a general dispensation from it in case of all Protestant marriages. Seventhly, under the *Lex Clandestinitatis* itself it is not necessary for validity that the priest should

declare anything. If he remains mute; if he is carried to the wedding by force; nay, if he covers his eyes and ears, after once having a glimpse of the intent of the contracting parties, it has been decided that the marriage holds good. His presence in this case is essential; his personal action is not. Eighthly, even under the law of Trent it is not essential that a priest should act. The ministers of the sacrament are the consenting parties; the pastor is only a "public witness." Once instituted in the diocese, therefore, if a bishop, or in the parish, he is at once competent to ratify a marriage, whether yet ordained or not. His deputy, it is true, must be a priest. Ninthly, even where the *Lex Clandestinitatis* is in force, Catholics may contract a nonclerical marriage, before witnesses, if for a month there is no general access to authorized clergymen within the region. We do not suppose we have remembered all the calumnious falsehoods bound up in the sentence of fourteen words before quoted; but we have already more than one to every two words. The reverend author has therefore an unquestionable right to lay claim to a special afflatus and assistance from the Prince of Darkness in inditing it.

It is refreshing to turn now to a statement, apparently erroneous indeed, but not informed with malice. A correspondent, writing some time ago to *The Outlook*, asks whether the opinion ascribed to Ballington Booth's Volunteers, that marriage is a sacrament, does not verge dangerously on Catholicism. The editor reassures him, saying that, as he understands, the Volunteers have an opinion of marriage quite the reverse. This is puzzling. Rome teaches that Jesus Christ, leaving marriage the same in substance as before, but retrenching these which were previously allowed, divorce and polygamy, has raised it to a new spiritual dignity and made it the channel of specific graces, especially for its proper ends. She therefore calls it a sacrament. "Quite the reverse" of this is what we have read in a paper published in Spanish by the missionaries of a Protestant Church. The article denies that marriage is a spiritual companionship, defines it to be a mere bodily association, and jeers at the opinion of its religious dignity and intrinsic permanence as a mere popish superstition. A great divine of our country, also, has lately, in a leading magazine, rebuked the

churches for not being willing to submit themselves, ecclesiastically no less than civilly, to the decisions of the State in matters of marriage and divorce. He accounts it presumption in them, even in the dispensation of their spiritual privileges, to refer themselves to the law of Christ. In this matter Christ is to have no authority in his own Church unless he can obtain the countersignature of Cæsar. Now these opinions are unquestionably "quite the reverse" of the teaching of Rome. But then these opinions are plain heathenism. The missionary and the divine, as to their doctrine of marriage, are not Christians at all. Are we to believe that Dr. Lyman Abbott and Ballington Booth are heathens too? Assuredly not. It is morally certain that both these gentlemen while widely diverging from a great many applications and hard delimitations of the Roman doctrine, agree heartily with the substance of it. Dr. Abbott, indeed, has been willing to incur from unbelievers, in the Church and out of it, the reproach of anarchism by insisting that the mind of God—which he finds centrally in Christ—is the only source of either ecclesiastical or civil authority. Opposing atheism and heathenism so vigorously at large, it is certain that he would never give way to it in this vital quarter. Indeed, *The Outlook* has reported with evident sympathy a proposal to make divorces *a toro*, indeed, somewhat mere facile, but, as soon as possible, to abolish divorces *a vinculo* altogether. This is to stand, in fundamental principle, with Rome.

Nor have we any reason to believe anything but that the Volunteers also would abhor both the libertinism of the missionary in the Spanish lands and the Cæsarism of our own divine. Rome, Abbott, and Booth, then, so far as we can see, stand together in the positions noted above, except that the two Protestants scruple over the use of the word "sacrament," which, however, Rome declares important for orthodoxy but unimportant for the validity of marriage. Again and again her tribunals and divines have laid down that where two baptized Christians, canonically competent, have intended, "in prevailing purpose," to contract a Christian union, not evasive of offspring and contemplated as permanent, their marriage is sacramental, whether they call it so or

not. "Christian union" and "sacrament" are in her view for validity equivalent terms. She judges that Christian Protestants do in fact, though not in word, hold marriage to be sacramental, and she seems to have the right of it. Is it said that the Volunteers, with most Protestants, hold that an absolute divorce may be granted for adultery, and perhaps for some other gross offenses? This would induce, indeed, a deep modification of the Roman view, but would be far from a reversal of it. Rome has never doubted that Greek marriages are sacramental, yet the Greek Church grants absolute divorces for adultery. The Council of Trent, while strongly affirming the Roman tenet of indissolubility, have been very careful not to anathematize the Greek opinion. Consequently, while the Western Church courts have always assumed the Roman view, the Church has never proclaimed it *de fide*. Indeed, the Uniate Greeks, though governed by Rome, also pronounce absolute divorces for adultery and the Holy See contents itself with saying, *Ipsi viderint*, "Let them be responsible." It appears then that Dr. Lyman Abbott has here been guilty of a very serious blunder indeed, but of one which, instead of calumniating Catholicism, unadvisedly calumniates himself and his fellow-Protestants—that is, the Christian majority—and puts Rome on a pinnacle of moral superiority on which she protests that she does not stand. It would be refreshing if we could have a few more of these inverted mistakes, which summon the apostolic See to defend our orthodoxy against ourselves.

Let us turn now to something entirely different, on page 689 of Volume VII of Dr. Schaff's *Church History*, edition of 1892. The author has copied as a note a passage from Dr. James Martineau, in which he is speaking of the severities of Torquemada. Martineau leans on the broken reed of Llorente's testimony, whose untrustworthiness has been sufficiently exposed by Prescott, Hefele, and others. Dr. Martineau, however, goes far beyond anything that Llorente gives him warrant for. It makes no great difference, to be sure, whether we allow or disallow Llorente's assignment to Torquemada's inquisitorship of nine thousand deaths and ninety thousand inferior punishments. As Llorente makes out the Spanish Inquisition, from its establishment in 1481 to 1808—

three hundred and twenty-seven years—to have put to death in all thirty thousand persons and punished three hundred and fifty thousand in other ways, mostly by church penances; if we assign nine thousand deaths and ninety thousand other punishments to Torquemada's eighteen years, it only leaves so much the less for the rest of the time. It would make five hundred deaths and five thousand lesser punishments a year for his time, against sixty-five deaths and seven hundred and fifty-five lesser punishments a year for the remaining duration. This disproportion is most unlikely, and can be shown to rest on false reckoning, yet we may let it go. Now for what were these ninety-nine thousand punishments, death, imprisonment, confiscation, penances inflicted by Torquemada? Llorente informs us that the Inquisition took cognizance of heresy, sacrilege, sorcery, violence offered to its own officers, immorality of its own officers, pretended orders, enticement by priests or monks of unsuspicious maidens into supposed marriage by means of forged dispensations or by a pretense of being laymen, unnatural crimes—to which we may doubtless add trafficking in forged indulgences, or relics, pretended prophecies, miracles, and the robbery of monasteries. Before long various purely political offenses were put under its jurisdiction. Now all these multiplied breaches of law or morals Dr. Martineau, by a singular flight of imagination, reduces to the one offense of heresy. "Not for offenses against the moral law," says he, "or crimes against society, but for thoughts of their own about religion, which only God and not the pope had allowed." It is plain that Dr. Martineau has forgotten, or never heard Llorente's own admonition, *Il ne faut pas calomnier même l'Inquisition.* Doubtless in Torquemada's time, when so many Jews and Moors had accepted baptism rather than to leave Spain, there were many more cases of heresy or suspected heresy than later. Yet Dr. Martineau adduces no evidence that these cases were a half or a third of the whole. They may have been two thirds, but he does not show it. Suppose Spain to have been as credulous and cruel about witchcraft as Germany, she should in eighteen years have burnt some three thousand on this charge alone. More or less, it is certain that a large proportion of Torque-

mada's punishments were for real or supposed "offenses against the moral law, or crimes against society."

Dr. Martineau next adds a clause which is not probably, but certainly, calumnious. It is, "Or for being Jews that would not be apostates." Now, in all ages Jews and Moslems were by the unwavering teaching of Rome, as unbaptized, not subject to Church jurisdiction. Mr. H. C. Lea points out how, as soon as the Inquisition was set up in Spain, the current of conversions to Christianity stopped. The Jews preferred their exemption from inquisitorial authority to any advantages they could derive from accepting baptism. Their final banishment from Spain, though heartily supported by national feeling and above all by Torquemada, was the work of neither Church nor Inquisition, but of the civil power. The reiterated complaints and continued interferences of the popes against the harshness and unfairness of the Spanish Inquisition are never directed against the impossible offense of summoning the Jews before its tribunal for refusing to change their religion. The popes aim only at protecting the already baptized Jews and Moors against what appeared to them a cruel suspiciousness of the Spaniards. The Spaniards, it is true, who thought that they knew their own affairs much better than the pope, were very imperfectly attentive to the papal admonitions that they should show greater mildness toward the newly baptized. Cardinal Ximenes stigmatizes Aragon and the pope as the two great enemies of the holy office. Rome, however, never accuses it of undertaking to sit in judgment on those who were outside the jurisdiction of the Church. An unconverted Jew, so long as these remained in Spain, was doubtless like anyone else answerable to the holy office on its civil side for contumelious treatment of Catholicism, but never for a refusal to accept it. Illustrious as James Martineau is in philosophy and ethics, he does not pretend to any eminence as a student of the later Roman Catholicism. As a Protestant and Englishman he simply picks up the slouching stories that have been our meat and drink ever since the days of good Queen Bess. The Spanish Inquisition was so bad, we think, that a few thousand Jews piled upon it are no great matter. It may be wondered, nevertheless, that

Dr. Schaff should have copied Martineau. The connection, however, will show sufficiently how far the venerable author was from any contumeliousness of intent, and that after stripping the note of all its exaggerations it still serves his purpose, which is simply to prove how unreasonable it is to compare Calvin with Torquemada. However, Dr. Schaff in one of his latest letters was kind enough to express to the writer his deep regret that he should, amid so many labors and distractions, have inadvertently copied so distorted a statement, and to promise that the matter should be rectified in the next edition. Let anyone, therefore, who reads the note in question remember that Dr. Schaff himself disavows it.

We have been considering grave matters, and turn now to a matter that is simply comical. A leading divine, speaking of the servile fear that prevailed in the Middle Ages and that is far enough from being extinct yet—the fear of coming directly, with filial confidence, to God—says, as we find him quoted by Mr. Usher: "Mediæval theology assumed an inherent and essential difference between God and man. So it built up a succession of mediators to fill the gap between the Father and his children, a Son to intercede with the Father, a Virgin Mary to intercede with the Son, saints to intercede with the Virgin Mary, and priests to intercede with the saints." It is news to us that the intercession of the Son with the Father was a fabrication of the Middle Ages. In our simplicity we had supposed it to be a doctrine pervading the New Testament. The intercession of the mother with the Son, for the West at least, undoubtedly came to its height in the Middle Ages. But that the saints are principally regarded as intercessors with the Virgin is another surprising piece of news. St. Bernard, in the *Paradiso*, it is true, intercedes with Mary for Dante, and we believe we have seen some other poetical instances of this. But where has the author quoted ever found a litany of the saints which invokes their intercession with Mary instead of their direct intercession with God? We, at least, have seen a great many such forms, but we are morally certain that we have never yet seen one in use by the people which invokes the intercession of the saints with the Virgin. Her intercession is viewed as far more efficacious than theirs, but it is pre-

cisely the same intercession that is asked of all—the intercession with God, with the Father and the Son. It is never, that we can call to mind, "All ye saints, intercede with the Virgin," but "All ye holy apostles, bishops and martyrs, all ye holy virgins and widows, St. Paul, St. Ambrose, St. Sebastian, St. Lucy, St. Bridget, etc., pray for us."

This learned divine has built up for us a regular liturgical "house that Jack built." According to him this is the scale: "Reverend father, intercede with the saints, that they will intercede with the Virgin, that she will intercede with the Son, that he will intercede with the Father." If not in direct assertion we have in the complexion of the whole scheme the evident assumption that the people are held unworthy to approach the saints, the priests to approach the Virgin, the saints to approach the Son, and the Virgin to approach the Father. This is ridiculous. Every Christian is authorized to supplicate the Father through the Son. He is taught that it is profitable to supplicate God, especially Christ, through the intercession of Mary. He is also taught that it is well to invoke the intercession of the saints, not with Mary, but with God. Nor does he approach either the saints or Mary through the priests. Every Catholic, man, woman, or child, addresses saints and Virgin directly. Even when the priests lead these devotions it is not as intercessors, but as coryphei. They do not invoke the saints or Virgin for the people, but with the people. This intercession is common and mutual. Every *paternoster* of every man, woman, and child is a direct address to the Father. The priests, however, are, as we know, preeminently the intercessors for the people. Their central act of intercession is the mass. And this consists in offering the crucified Son himself, not to the saints, nor to the Virgin, but directly to the eternal Father. This gradation of intercessions has therefore been evoked by the author largely "from the depths of his own moral consciousness." But the fountain of blunders is too ebullient for one treatment.

Charles C. Starbuck

Art. VI.—ALEXANDER SMITH AND THE "LIFE DRAMA."

The subject of this paper was born at Kilmarnock, Scotland, on the last day of December, 1830. In his early childhood he evinced signs of unusual promise, so that his parents desired to educate him for the ministry; but the hard exigencies of poverty compelled the lad's removal from school. He was placed in a linen factory to follow his father's trade of pattern designer. Here, amid the din of looms, the passion for poesy seized him. He soon found an appreciative and sympathizing patron in the editor of the *Glasgow Citizen*, in whose columns the first products of his literary genius caught the public eye. Through the good offices of a friendly clergyman he found access to an influential London periodical, and soon won the attention and friendly regard of such literary notables as Herbert Spencer and George Henry Lewes.

Glasgow at this period was unusually prolific in amateur poets. Smith was wont to make humorous allusion to the circumstance that upon one occasion he sat down to a banquet table with seventy other poets besides himself. In 1853 the *Life Drama* flashed like a meteor upon the literary world. The factory lad of twenty-three summers suddenly found himself famous. The poem swiftly ran through several editions, the highest literary authorities in England and Scotland bestowing unstinted praise upon it. Great expectations were aroused, and such opinions as the following greeted the new author: "Alexander Smith is a born singer, a man of genius, not a musical echo of other singers;" "It is seldom that a new work is met which furnishes such incontestable evidence of great powers by the author as the *Life Drama;*" "The most striking characteristic of these poems is their exuberance of imagery—fresh, vivid, concrete images actually present to the poet's mind thrown out with a distinctness and a delicacy which only poets can achieve;" "It is impossible to read three consecutive pages without feeling in the presence of a spirit moved with a profound sense of all forms of spiritual beauty." The *Life Drama* was also compared by one critic

to an Italian harp, "fitful, wild, melancholy, often suggestive of something exquisitely sweet and graceful, but faint, fugitive and incoherent."

Soon after the publication of the *Life Drama* Smith received a clerical appointment in Edinburgh University, with an annual stipend of a hundred and fifty pounds attached. Here his official duties were nominal, and availing himself of his literary leisure he produced in collaboration with another poet a volume of *War Sonnets*. These were followed two years later by his *City Poems*. The publication of these later poems was the signal for the most merciless onslaught of criticism and virulent depreciation to which any poet has ever been subjected. He was boldly charged with wholesale plagiarisms. A coterie of unfriendly critics met together night after night, and by a laborious and elaborate compilation of parallel passages attempted to prove that every passage, phrase, and line, every period and semicolon were stolen outright from Shakespeare, Tennyson, Keats, and Shelley. The criticisms were coarsely cruel and brutally unjust. Smith plagiarized as the flower plagiarizes from the soil, the sunshine, the showers; as the bee plagiarizes from the flowers. Nevertheless, the critics were in positions of authority, and were influential enough to greatly injure the sale and circulation of *City Poems*, which by the fairest tests of criticism showed a marked advance upon the *Life Drama*.

Happily Smith was one of those admirably poised natures which cannot be spoiled by praise nor soured by criticism. Like every genuine poet and artist he found an unfailing source of inspiration in his love of his art:

> He was one
> Who could not help it, for it was his nature
> To blossom into song as 'tis a tree's
> To leaf itself in April.

In the midst of this storm of adverse criticism he remarked to a friend, "One does feel these things, and it is queer to come out in the sunlight and walk along the street after you have read columns of violent and abusive criticism; but I find it only takes me just twenty-four hours to get over such things."

He now turned his attention to prose composition and made himself at once a new and distinct reputation as a prose writer—an achievement which finds few parallels in the literary annals of the century. He produced a most charming volume of prose idyls, entitled *Dreamthorp*. This was followed speedily by another rare volume, *A Summer in Skye*, which became very popular and contains his best prose writing. This volume was the inspiration of a romantic marriage to a young lady of the Island of Skye, where he had established a summer home. The book has been highly praised by critics for its quaint charm and sympathy with nature. *Alfred Hogart's Household*, an experiment in fiction, was published in 1866. This, Smith's first and only venture in fiction and his last literary product, was autobiographical in its character. Along with some faults in construction, it was characterized by rare grace of description.

He now turned his thoughts anew to poesy, and meditated bringing his riper and maturer powers to bear upon a great poetic composition and thus fulfill the admonition which he bestowed upon himself in such exquisite lines in the *Life Drama:*

> Strive for the poet's crown, but ne'er forget
> How poor are fancy's blooms to thoughtful fruits;
> That gold and crimson mornings, though more bright
> Than soft blue days, are scarcely half their worth.

Upon returning to Edinburgh, at the close of his summer vacation in the Island of Skye, in the autumn of 1866, he contracted a violent cold which developed into malignant diphtheria and hurried him into his grave at the early age of thirty-seven, on January 5, 1867. Almost half a century has elapsed since the obscure Scotch lad emerged from the linen factory in Glasgow to find himself the literary lion of the day. We associate him with the shadowy traditions of a vanished generation, and yet were he living to-day he would be only seventy years old. As to personal traits and characteristics, he was under middle stature, with light brown hair and a placid and shrewd expression of countenance. He was quiet, free from pretense, not explosive nor aggressive in conversation. Silent and reserved in general company, with his familiar

friends he was open, frank, and convivial. One who knew him intimately remarked, "He never said anything silly or untrue." The continuance of criticism upon him, however, even after his death, is well set forth in the following verse:

> No sooner was he hence than critic worms
> Were swarming on the body of his fame,
> And thus they judged the dead:
> "This poet was
> An April tree whose vermeil-loaded boughs
> Promised to autumn apples juiced and red,
> But never came to fruit. He is to us
> But a rich odor—a faint music-swell.
> Poet he was not in the larger sense;
> He could write pearls, but he could never write
> A poem sound and perfect as a star. His most judicious act
> Was dying when he did; the next five years
> Had fingered all the fine dust from his wings,
> And left him poor as we. He died—'twas shrewd!
> And came with all his youth and unblown hopes
> On the world's heart, and touched it into tears."

As respects the merits of the *Life Drama*, upon which the fame of Alexander Smith as a poet chiefly rests, it may be conceded that the poem is deficient in dramatic grasp of subject, in metrical quality, in restraint of expression. As a dramatic narrative its parts are somewhat incoherent, its transitions are too sudden, violent, and causeless. It shows perhaps somewhat too obviously the influence of Keats and Tennyson. Yet, after suitable deductions in deference to adverse criticism, it still remains true that the poem is one of the most interesting and remarkable literary products of the century. In a cyclopedia of quotations, entitled *Living Thoughts of Leading Thinkers*, which has been compiled with exceptional literary discrimination, there are twenty-three selections from Shakespeare, eight from Tennyson, and sixteen from the writings of Smith—nearly all being taken from the *Life Drama*. It is scarcely an exaggeration to affirm that no poem has been produced in the century which contains more quotable passages, more instances of rare strength and beauty than the *Life Drama*.

But the crowning excellence of the poem as a dramatic narrative is the splendid moral purpose which pervades it.

When it was published the tone of American criticism was for the most part harsh and uncomplimentary and in some instances coarsely abusive, with an evident tincture of Anglophobia. One of the most impartial of these American reviewers, with a manifest attempt at fairness, misconceives and misjudges the entire character and purpose of the poem, after the following fashion:

> Walter, the hero of the poem, is too obviously Alexander Smith breathing forth his own aspirations, pandering to his own sensuous nature, unveiling the repulsive deformities of his own moral character. The grand defect, the damning defect, of the work is in the lack of elevated moral character and correct moral teaching. How sad to find so gifted a spirit reveling in the low and base conception of a putrid heart and distempered brain.

What an amazing and what a melancholy perversion of the critical judgment. One of the most conspicuous merits of the *Life Drama* is the fact that it abounds in lofty moral sentiments, that it makes profound and impressive recognition of religious faith and principles, that it is pervaded and dominated by a lofty moral purpose.

The poem portrays most vividly those vicissitudes of sorrow and disappointment, those processes of moral disillusion, through which human souls are chastened and disciplined and refined from the dross of selfish ambitions and exalted to the high plane of spiritual aspiration and endeavor. The poet hero of the story first appears upon the scene smitten with the passion for fame, consumed with a feverish longing to create an imperishable masterpiece which will win him immortal renown.

> For poesy my heart and pulses beat,
> For poesy my blood runs red and fleet.
> My soul is followed
> By strong ambitions to outroll a lay,
> Whose melody will haunt the world for aye,
> Charming it onward on its golden way.

But out of the vicissitudes of life's experiences there is slowly evolved in the soul of the hero, Walter, that spiritual transfiguration of motive, purpose, and character whereby the passion for fame and fortune gives place to the ennobling pas-

sion for righteousness. With lofty, clarified spiritual vision he exclaims:

> One path is clear before us; it may lead
> O'er perilous rocks, cross lands without a well,
> Through deep and difficult chasms, but therein
> The whiteness of the soul is kept, and that,
> Not joy nor pain, is victory.

What poet of our times has given truer, loftier expression to the overmastering passion for righteousness?

The *Life Drama* makes implied recognition of the three moral alternatives in human life of which every man must make choice. In the parable of the prodigal son Jesus has at least suggested these three great alternatives. The first is a life of dissipation and debauchery, as exemplified in the career of the younger son, who spent all his substance in riotous living. There is again the alternative of a prudent, thrifty, self-content life of Pharisaic propriety, as exemplified in the career of the elder brother, who husbanded his material substance but dwarfed and impoverished his soul. To understand the profound significance of the parable we must put Jesus alongside the two brothers as a type of a God-centered man, suggesting to us the third and highest moral alternative—a life of entire surrender to God, fulfilling the will of God in the service of man. The second alternative, exemplified in the career of the elder brother—a self-seeking, self-centered life of smooth Pharisaic propriety—is the alternative chosen by the average man, because, for the average man, it requires no strenuous moral effort to maintain such a life. There are, however, men of open, magnanimous natures, ardently impulsive, who cannot easily content themselves with the tame monotony of a self-complacent life of Pharisaic respectability. Such men are almost forced to choose the highest ideals and commit themselves to the passionate pursuit of righteousness, or they are in peril of dropping to the low plane of sensuous indulgences, of open debauchery.

Such a man was Walter, the hero of the *Life Drama*. In the poem Smith has powerfully reproduced the parable of the prodigal son. Walter and Violet—the heroine of the story—are brought together. Under the stress of extraordinary temp-

tation these two ingenuous, ardent natures surrender themselves to the flames of passion, and fall from rectitude. Then follow the workings of remorse in the soul of Walter, in which we see portrayed most vividly the exceeding sinfulness of sin:

Hear me, God.
Sin met me and embraced me on the way;
Methought her cheeks were red, her lips had bloom.
I kissed her bold lips, dallied with her hair;
She sang me into slumber; I awoke—
It was a putrid corpse that clung to me,
That clings to me like memory to the damned,
That rots into my being, Father, God!
I cannot shake it off, it clings, it clings.

As there came to the soul of the despairing prodigal in the parable a vision of the blessedness of his father's house, so to Walter, in the depths of his moral degradation, there comes the majestic vision of a high and glorious manhood. Into the dark night of his remorseful despair God's ideals shine like the eternal stars. He feels the kindling of holy aspiration, of high resolve:

God is a worker,
Why work not I? the veriest mote that sports
Its one day life within the sunny beam
Has its stern duties, wherefore have I none?
I will throw off this dead and useless past,
As a strong runner straining for his life
Unclasps a mantle to the hungry wind;
A mighty purpose rises large and slow
From out the fluctuations of my soul.

But a more inspiring vision passes before him, the vision of that divine love which glorifies human life and transfigures duty with the light of privilege. He says:

All things have something more than barren use;
There is a scent upon the brier,
A tremulous splendor in the autumn dews,
Cold morns are fringed with fire;
The clodded earth goes up in sweet-breathed flowers;
In music dies poor human speech,
And into beauty blow these hearts of ours,
When love is born in each.

Life is transfigured in the soft and tender
Light of love, as a volume dun
Of rolling smoke becomes a wreathed splendor.
In the declining sun.

As the consummation of the dramatic story Walter and Violet come together, with spiritualized hopes and purposes ennobled through the discipline of sorrow; and thus, with united hearts and united hands confronting the future in glad and willing surrender to God's high and holy ideals, Walter addresses Violet:

Lift, lift me up by thy sweet inspiration, as the tide
Lifts up a stranded boat upon the beach.
Great duties are before me and great songs,
And, whether crowned or crownless when I fall,
It matters not, so as God's work is done.
I've learned to prize the quiet lightning deed,
Not the applauding thunder at its heels,
Which men call fame.
Our night is past;
We stand in precious sunrise, and beyond
A long day stretches to the very end.

Joseph Laycock

Art. VII.—JOHN WESLEY, CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST.

Socialism and Christian socialism are not one. The former assumes that human society is wrong, and that the whole social order needs readjustment; but, while it proposes methods for righting matters between man and man, it has nothing to say concerning the relations between man and his God. Christian socialism agrees that human society is wrongly adjusted, that the right relations of man to man are not regarded, and that in many cases they are not understood. But it also aims to bring men into right relations to God, their Father, through Jesus Christ the Saviour, and to use the pattern of Christ's life and the principles he taught in the readjustment of the social order. Socialism is sometimes called "scientific socialism" to distinguish it from Christian socialism, as though the latter is unscientific—a claim that all do not admit, because the Gospel, which is the weapon in the hand of the Christian socialist, is itself the science of character and right conduct even more than it is a way of escape from the doom of wrongdoing.

The leaders in Christian socialism have been, as they ought to have been, Christian ministers such as Charles Kingsley, Frederick D. Maurice, and Frederick W. Robertson. We also find Thomas Hughes, Ruskin, and Arthur Dennison among the lay leaders in England, where this movement began. These men undertook to bridge over the great gulf which yawned between the Church and the people, dogma and duty, preaching and practicing, theoretical and applied Christianity. They believed that the Gospel is the panacea for all the individual ills of men and for all the moral maladies of society. Their work was that of going about to do good to the bodies, minds, and homes of men, so that all the interests of humanity may be redeemed from wrong and wrongdoers. The results of their work remain until this day. The inspiration they imparted to the Church and to society in general is too great to be tabulated. As one has written, they regarded the world as "the subject of redemption."

But John Wesley anticipated very many of the aims and

methods of the modern Christian socialists. Scarcely second to, but rather as a part of his great evangelistic movement was his work as a Christian socialist. More than one hundred years before Maurice, Kingsley, and Robertson among the clergy, and Thomas Hughes, Ruskin, and Arthur Dennison among the laity had existed the "Holy Club" at Oxford. Their principles were those that most, if not all, modern Christian socialists would adopt, and are found in the "Introductory Letter" that precedes Wesley's *Journal*, as follows:

I. Whether it does not concern all men of all conditions to imitate Him, as much as they can, who "went about doing good"?

Whether all Christians are not concerned in that command, "While we have time let us do good to all men"?

Whether we shall not be more happy hereafter, the more good we do now?

Whether we can be happy at all hereafter, unless we have, according to our power, "fed the hungry, clothed the naked, visited those that are sick, and in prison;" and made all these actions subservient to a higher purpose, even the saving of souls from death?

Whether it be not our bounden duty always to remember that He did more for us than we can do for him, who assures us, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me"?

II. Whether, upon these considerations, we may not try to do good to our acquaintance? Particularly, whether we may not try to convince them of the necessity of being Christians?

Whether of the consequent necessity of being scholars?

Whether of the necessity of method and industry, in order to either learning or virtue?

Whether we may not try to persuade them to confirm and increase their industry, by communicating as often as they can?

Whether we may not mention to them the authors whom we conceive to have wrote the best on those subjects?

Whether we may not assist them, as we are able, from time to time, to form resolutions upon what they read in those authors, and to execute them with steadiness and perseverance?

III. Whether, upon the considerations above mentioned, we may not try to do good to those that are hungry, naked, or sick? In particular, whether, if we know any necessitous family, we may not give them a little food, clothes, or physic, as they want?

Whether we may not give them, if they can read, a Bible, Common Prayer Book, or Whole Duty of Man?

Whether we may not, now and then, inquire how they have used them; explain what they do not understand, and enforce what they do?

Whether we may not enforce upon them, more especially, the necessity of private prayer, and of frequenting the church and sacrament?

Whether we may not contribute, what little we are able, toward having their children clothed and taught to read?

Whether we may not take care that they be taught their catechism, and short prayers for morning and evening?

IV. Lastly, Whether, upon the considerations above mentioned, we may not try to do good to those that are in prison? In particular, Whether we may not release such well-disposed persons as remain in prison for small sums?

Whether we may not lend smaller sums to those that are of any trade, that they may procure themselves tools and materials to work with?

Whether we may not give to them who appear to want it most, a little money, or clothes, or physic?

Whether we may not supply as many as are serious enough to read, with a Bible, and Whole Duty of Man?

Whether we may not, as we have opportunity, explain and enforce these upon them, especially with respect to public and private prayer and the blessed sacrament?

The date of this writing is December 1, 1730, more than a hundred years before the Christian socialists, Maurice, Kingsley, and Robertson, began their work. But how exactly the aims of the two societies correspond. The same Holy Spirit animates the minds and hearts of both sets of men.

Christian socialism interests itself in the education of the poor. "Free and assisted education for the children" of the needy is its modern watchword. But this, as we have seen, was in the programme of the Holy Club. John Wesley was especially devoted to this object. His very first educational work was the founding of a school in Oxford. He paid the mistress and clothed some, if not all, the scholars. It was ragged school work before ragged schools were thought of. In Kingswood before Methodism had even a site for a chapel the stone for the school for the children of the poor colliers was consecrated by Whitefield and passed over to Wesley to build upon. He did so, and thus began the work of Methodist education. Although this school or its successor eventually became an institution for the sons of Methodist preachers, yet Wesley never ceased his well-begun work for the education of the masses. His school at the Foundry, under

Silas Told, was one of the very first of its kind. Furthermore, he democratized learning by writing, editing, and publishing at what seemed ridiculously low prices text-books and standard reading for the poor. His grammars, logic, histories of England and of the Church, together with his great Christian Library, form part of the four hundred and fifty-three different publications which he issued for the education of the people. Dean Farrar says, "The vast spread of religious instruction by weekly periodicals and the cheap press with all its stupendous consequences were inaugurated by him." This same broad-minded dean says: "The British and Foreign Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, the London Missionary Society, even the Church Missionary Society owe not a little to his initiative. . . . He gave a great impulse to both national education and to technical education." In initiating an American Methodist college at the first Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church our fathers only followed their leader, who interpreted God's command to love him with all the mind as one to be obeyed. Wesley was no believer in the dogma that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," while his motto for Kingswood School is still good for any school or scholar, "For the Glory of God, the Service of His Church, and of the State."

Christian socialists of to-day work for the emancipation of the white slaves of the factories and the sweatshops. John Wesley had not to meet these conditions. There were no great factory problems in his day. But African slavery existed, and into that evil this social reformer thrust his sword up to the very hilt. What cared he if "Lady Huntingdon trafficked in human nature and George Whitefield held slaves." He roused himself in behalf of the poor trampled bondsmen, denouncing slavery in general as "the sum of all villanies," and American slavery in particular as "the vilest that ever saw the sun." His very last letter was written to that other Christian socialist, who did not know he was one, William Wilberforce, encouraging him in his parliamentary work for the emancipation of slaves. Miss Braddon, in her recently published book, *The Infidel*, represents Wesley as silently approving of Whitefield's purchase of more slaves, because he

did not then and there protest against slavery. But, having received more light on Wesley's attitude toward the abomination, she promises to remove the passage from further editions of the book.

The twin evil of slavery was and is drunkenness. Like some other early temperance reformers Wesley was not himself a teetotaler. He used wine and beer in moderation; but ardent spirits, the distillers, the venders, and the drinkers thereof as a beverage he most ardently denounced. Some of the strongest utterances against drunkards and drunkard-makers came from his tongue and pen. The swearer is preached to, and is then pressed with a special tract, as is also the smuggler. How much the British government saved by his little tract, "A Word to a Smuggler," it would be impossible to tell. He preached and wrote against the evils of his day. He also expelled from his Societies those who would not heed his warnings and desist from such wrongdoing. The briber and the bribe receiver also shared the same fate. "Show me thy faith by thy works" was his motto. He sought to make men good citizens of earth, as the very best preparation for citizenship in heaven.

Christian socialism undertakes the task of showing the rich their duties and privileges toward the poor. Unlike scientific socialism it does not believe in the equalization of capital, but it does believe in its moralization. Wesley spoke out on this subject as boldly perhaps as any man of his day. He has also written on this subject. His sermons on "The Use of Money," "The Good Steward," and the "Reformation of Manners" are good socialistic tracts for these modern times. We wonder such Christian socialists as Professor Herron does not often refer to them. Wesley first spoke and then wrote burning words on the wrong use of money, and illustrated his sermons by his own daily life of caring for the poor. The rules of the Holy Club, as we have seen, show its members to have all been Christian socialists in this very important respect. From his student days, when he even parted with the pictures from his walls, until an old man eighty-eight years of age we see Wesley tramping London streets in the melting snow, begging money for the poor and, like his Mas-

ter, going about doing good. During his life he gave away more than $200,000.

His methods of helping the poor were such, one hundred and sixty years ago, as we now follow. We boast that we have learned to help them without pauperizing them; the "Associated Charities" has taught us this. Wesley's plan was to immediately relieve present necessity, then at once help the poor to help themselves. He knew that to give a hungry man a loaf of bread only would be to cause him to look to him for another when that was eaten. He rather gave him an inspiration and also an opportunity for getting another loaf for himself by honest toil. For those who lack employment the good Christian socialist opens a bureau, to which the "out-of-work" may come and find employment. John Wesley did more than this. He made his chapels not only bureaus but workshops. Thus he gave the poor man who was out of employment a chance to help himself. On Tuesday, November 25, 1740, he writes in his *Journal:*

> After several methods proposed for employing those who were out of business, we determined to make a trial of one which several of our brethren recommended to us. Our aim was, with as little expense as possible, to keep them at once from want and idleness; in order to which, we took twelve of the poorest and a teacher into the Society room, where they were employed for four months, till spring came on, in carding and spinning of cotton. And the design answered. They were employed and maintained with very little more than the product of their own labor.

Thus for four months the place of worship was also the place of work. Carding, spinning, and praying were done in the same auditorium. This was not considered a desecration of the house of prayer. Frequently the naves of old churches and cathedrals were used as market places on stormy days. The chancel only was kept for sacred uses, but business was done within sight of the altar, instead of in sight of the cross in the market place. Six months later new needs called for new methods. On Thursday, May 7, 1741, Wesley writes:

> I reminded the United Society that many of our brethren and sisters had not needful food, many were destitute of convenient clothing, many were out of business and that without their own fault, and many sick

and ready to perish; that I had done what in me lay to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to employ the poor, and to visit the sick; but was not alone sufficient for these things, and therefore desired all whose hearts were as my heart: 1. To bring what clothes each could spare, to be distributed among those that wanted most. 2. To give weekly a penny, or what they could afford, for the relief of the poor and sick. My design, I told them, is to employ for the present all the women who were out of business, and desire it, in knitting. To these we will first give the common price for that work they do, and then add according as they need. Twelve persons are appointed to inspect these, and to visit and provide things needful for the sick. Each of these is to visit all the sick within their district every other day, and to meet on Tuesday evening to give an account of what they have done and consult what can be done further.

The Wesleyan idea of labor and the laborer may be learned from Charles Wesley's hymns for the workingman. He sent him about his daily toil singing the high praises of his God. For his waking and rising, on a workday, the following words were adopted:

Are there not in the laborer's day
Twelve hours, in which he safely may
His calling's work pursue?
Though sin and Satan still are near,
Nor sin nor Satan can I fear,
With Jesus in my view.

. . . . . .

Ten thousand snares my path beset,
Yet will I, Lord, the work complete,
Which thou to me hast given;
Regardless of the pains I feel,
Close by the gates of death and hell,
I urge my way to heaven.

It is now time for the workman to put on coat and hat and kiss his wife and children good-bye. As he leaves his home for the place of toil, Wesley sets him singing to Christ the hymn entitled, in the present Methodist Hymnal, "Beginning the labors of the day:"

Forth in thy name, O Lord, I go,
My daily labors to pursue;
Thee, only thee, resolved to know,
In all I think, or speak, or do.

. . . . . .

Thee will I set at my right hand,
Whose eyes mine inmost substance see;
And labor on at thy command,
And offer all my works to thee.

Give me to bear thy easy yoke,
And every moment watch and pray;
And still to things eternal look,
And hasten to thy glorious day.

For thee delightfully employ
Whate'er thy bounteous grace hath given;
And run my course with even joy,
And closely walk with thee to heaven.

The man has now reached his work, and has "gotten on to his job," as he himself would say. Charles Wesley then sets him singing at his labor as follows:

Summoned my labor to renew,
And glad to act my part,
Lord, in thy name my work I do,
And with a single heart.

End of my every action thou,
In all things thee I see:
Accept my hallowed labor now,
I do it unto thee.

Whate'er the Father views as thine,
He views with gracious eyes;
Jesus, this mean oblation join
To thy great sacrifice.

Stamped with an infinite desert,
My work he then shall own;
Well pleased with me, when mine thou art,
And I his favored son.

When the day's service is done and the workman stands looking at it, Wesley has him sing the following hymn for the consecration of his labor:

Son of the carpenter, receive
This humble work of mine;
Worth to my meanest labor give,
By joining it to thine.

. . . . . .

Careless through outward cares I go,
From all distraction free:
My hands are but engaged below,
My heart is still with thee.

O when wilt thou, my life, appear?
Then gladly will I cry,
"'Tis done, the work thou gav'st me here,
'Tis finished, Lord," and die!

This is a picture of the early Wesleyan laboring man. He has been taught to lift his toil, menial though it seem, up to that plane where he could do it as unto the Lord.

Wesley also fortified the employer with hymns such as the following for the beginning of a new business day:

I and my house will serve the Lord:
But first, obedient to his word
I must myself appear;
By actions, words, and tempers show
That I my heavenly Master know,
And serve with heart sincere.

I must the fair example set;
From those that on my pleasure wait
The stumbling-block remove;
Their duty by my life explain,
And still in all my works maintain
The dignity of love.

. . . . . .

Lord, if thou didst the wish infuse,
A vessel fitted for thy use
Into thy hands receive:
Work in me both to will and do;
And show them how believers true,
And real Christians, live.

For him in the rush and whirl of business on the exchange or in the market place Wesley wrote:

Lo! I come with joy to do
The Master's blessed will;
Him in outward works pursue,
And serve his pleasure still.
Faithful to my Lord's commands,
I still would choose the better part,
Serve with careful Martha's hands,
And loving Mary's heart.

. . . . . .

Thou, O Lord, my portion art,
Before I hence remove!
Now my treasure and my heart
Are all laid up above;

Far above all earthly things,
While yet my hands are here employed,
Sees my soul the King of kings,
And freely talks with God.

. . . . . .

Is it to be wondered that such employers and employees both prospered? That such a spirit infused into the minds of capitalist and laborer gave dignity to toil? With this spirit the employer did not regard his operatives as "hands" but as souls. No wonder the Methodists have grown rich and are now able, on the other side of the Atlantic, to lay a million guineas on God's altar, and, on this side, two million eagles as a thank offering for the blessings of the past century. The Wesleys made songs for the laborer and his employer, and cared not so much who made economic laws for them. They sought to Christianize both, knowing all else would soon right itself. How strikingly these hymns contrast with the songs of socialists on labor and capital, employer and employee.

John Wesley was also a physician. Multitudes of the poor were sick, and could not afford a doctor. There was probably not a free medical dispensary in all England when Wesley began his Christian socialistic work. In 1746 he solved the difficulty by what he calls a "desperate expedient," saying, "I will prepare and give them physic myself." For twenty-six years he had made anatomy and physic a diversion; at forty-three he takes up the study and practice of medicine, engaging an apothecary and a surgeon to assist him. In three months he had above three hundred patients and had used over forty pounds' worth of medicines. After three years' practice he did not know of one patient who had died on his hands. In 1747 he opened a free dispensary at the Foundry, in London, and four months later one in Bristol. Writing to Blackwell the banker, January 26, 1747, he says that in the latter dispensary alone he has over two hundred patients, the number increasing daily. A year later he writes:

We have ever since had great reason to praise God for his continued blessing on this undertaking. Many lives have been saved, many sicknesses healed, much pain and want prevented or removed. Many heavy hearts have been made glad, many mourners comforted, and the visitors have found him whom they serve a present reward for all their labor.

For the poor and sick who could not come to him he provided visitors—first promiscuous, then organized. Forty-six of these divided London into twenty-three districts, and each sick person was visited by two of these, three times a week. The four rules for visitors were: "(1) Be plain and open in dealing with souls. (2) Be mild, tender, patient. (3) Be cleanly in all you do for the sick. (4) Be not nice." Three years later, in 1777, The Willow Walk Society near Moorfields, but, more generally and properly speaking, "The United Society for Visiting and Relieving the Sick," was organized. This was superseded by the "Strangers' Friend Society," for which Wesley drew up rules about a year before he died. He says of it, "So this is also one of the fruits of Methodism." Royalty patronized it for years. In 1868 there were made 32,460 visits by its three hundred and fifty volunteer workers. It is still doing Christlike labor among all sorts and conditions of the poor and sick, irrespective of denomination or nationality. This was a part of John Wesley's Mercy and Help Department, and this year celebrates its one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary. For those who could not come to him and for general domestic use he wrote *Primitive Physick*, a book whose first edition was issued on June 11, 1747, and which went through twenty-seven editions in England, the last one coming out in 1850. In his works Wesley also published Dr. Tissot's *Advices with Respect to Health*. He was up to date in his treatment of disease. For instance, on November 16, 1747, having heard of the electrical machines, he went to see them in use. On March 17, 1753, he studies Dr. Franklin's *Letters on Electricity*, and on February 4, 1768, he reads Dr. Priestley's "ingenious book on electricity." Like a true Christian socialist, in short, he believed in and worked for the redemption of the bodies of men from disease, as well as their souls from sin. Twenty-four of the thirty-four recorded miracles of Jesus were wrought upon the sick, and Wesley was a true disciple of the Great Physician.

For widows and orphans Wesley also made provision. Fifteen sick widows were housed at the Foundry, eating at the same table as did Wesley and his preachers. The third chapel he built, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, was called "The Orphan

House of Wesley." His first chapel was also designed to be a home for orphans. It still stands, the very first of all the Methodist churches, in Broadmead, Bristol, fifteen minutes' walk from the orphan homes of the late George Müller. One year before he died, Wesley also founded in Dublin an almshouse for aged Methodists, which is still prospering.

Wesley also acted as banker for the poor. About the middle of 1746 he saw that some needy men could be started in business for themselves if they had a little capital. He set to work and begged £30 16*s.* to begin with. In a year and a half no less than two hundred and fifty-five persons had been helped. Only one pound at a time would he lend, and it was to be paid back weekly within three months. This scheme pleased all sorts of wise people, even an eminent deist sending him a guinea toward this fund. It is said that many a successful London tradesman was started in business in this way. In Bristol, Wesley started a "Provident Society," a kind of savings bank for the poor. Some Bristolians did not like this, and ridiculed him. A gorgeously colored picture was issued representing Wesley pouring out sacks of gold, and, while his followers were stowing away the coin, the powers of darkness were dragging Wesley away, but not to the higher regions. This was his solution of the capital and labor question. He helped the laborer to become a capitalist by his "Provident Society," and the capitalist to aid the laborer by his loan fund. Thus he brought together capitalist and laborer, anticipating savings banks and lending clubs for the poor.

From these facts we conclude that the earliest Methodism was truly of Christian socialistic spirit. This is recognized by such writers as Canon Moore Ele, who, in his Hulsean Lecture, affirms, "The man who did the most to reform the social life of England in the last century was John Wesley." His earliest followers took up the work of elevating the masses socially, as well as spiritually. But, with the opening of the nineteenth century, Wesley being no longer with his organization the Methodists as a people began to slide back from the advanced position they had taken in social matters. Through nearly the whole of the century we have been emphasizing the evangelistic, at the expense of the socialistic,

work for which we were partly raised up. For a couple of decades past, on both sides of the Atlantic, we have been trying to return to our former work, and to regain our position. The great forward movements of Manchester, London, Birmingham, and other centers in England, as also in New York, Chicago, and other American centers; the deaconess movement; homes for children and the aged; Methodist hospitals and institutional churches are all attempts to return to our great commission of saving the bodies, minds, and daily lives of the people, for the redemption of whose souls Christ has died. The Salvation Army has been wiser than we. The careful student of its work from the beginning will feel that, for some years past, simply as an evangelistic agency, it has been a declining force. That noble son of Wesley, General Booth, at once saw that something must be done. The novel and startling methods of calling attention to the need of the salvation of the soul no longer would attract. Old circus buildings, theaters, jam factories, skating rinks, stables, and such places which once were packed to suffocation, and which once rang with hallelujahs, were now well-nigh deserted. The congregations had dwindled from thousands to scores at the most. Then General Booth added Christian socialism to growing evangelism. He began to care for the bodies, houses, minds, families, and all the other interests of men. He struck boldly out for the redemption of the whole man, not only from sin but from all its present, as well as its future, consequences. He began to fight dirt and debt, as well as drink and other doings of the devil. *In Darkest England and The Way Out* was his slogan cry which reached the ears and opened pockets of philanthropists in all English-speaking lands. The Army put on new life, with its new activities. We incline to think that, but for this socialistic new departure, it would now be a thing of the past.

The sooner Methodism imitates the socialistic departure of the Salvation Army, at least in the underlying principles, the sooner shall we be found in the old paths. Had Methodism lived up to her high calling and privileges and never have narrowed down to almost exclusively evangelistic and family church work, there would have been no need of the Young

Men's Christian Association, nor of many of the fraternal orders and mutual benefit societies which attract men and too often absorb their attention, to the neglect of the Church and worst of all to the neglect of Christ's great salvation. When a man is won from his cups and cards he needs a place to go to and friends to meet of the other kind, or his very loneliness may drive him back to his former life. The coffeehouse, with its well-lighted reading room and refreshments at a little above cost and its company of good people, will soon place him where he can stand alone, and will then put him where he can help others. It is not enough to get him converted; his environment must also be changed. His work only begins when he has repented and believed to the saving of his soul. His body, his social nature, and his home must also be benefited. In certain parts of Ireland, in John Wesley's days, the Methodist homes could be distinguished by their outside appearance. The windows and doorsteps were clean, and the walks in front of them were swept. Clean hearts were followed by clean houses. Wesley is credited with the saying that "cleanliness is next to godliness," but we rather think that he regarded it as a part of godliness.

The method of this great Christian socialist was philosophical and scriptural. He sought to reform society by first securing the regeneration of the individual. His method was from center to circumference, and not from circumference to center. His idea was that the very best way to change a man's environment is to change his moral condition. Christianize him, and his social life will be Christianized. Wesley understood that the new kingdom to be established on the earth is to be made up of a new humanity, and that Christ through his Gospel is now making all things new. He combined the zealously evangelistic with the decidedly Christian socialistic, the one a complement of the other. Were he with us to-day we think he would say, "Go ye and do likewise."

W. H. Meredith.

Art. VIII.—THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF BAPTISM.

What have the early Christian monuments to say concerning the mode of baptism? The answer to this question must be found in its patient and scientific study. The student has been busy during the last few decades in critically reexamining the early Christian mosaics and catacomb frescoes, the attention of a brilliant circle of archæologists having been focussed upon these monuments. Easily first in this circle, now that the learned Commendatore De Rossi has left us, is Monsignor Wilpert, of the Campo Santo Vaticano, at Rome. He has cleaned out some catacomb chambers, discovered new frescoes, and corrected certain errors of interpretation by the earlier copyists—the result being that the recent thorough reexamination of these chambers has started up afresh the discussion concerning the story the early Christian paintings have to tell, and that consequently the representations of baptism in early Christian art naturally come up for a fresh discussion.

In examining these monuments, as well as in the study of the entire circle of Christian art, we are impressed with the fact that there is, generally speaking, one uniform mode of representing baptism. The subject always stands in the water, whether it be stream or font. Fresco, mosaic, and sculpture with rare exceptions adhere to this treatment. Not in one instance is the subject represented as going under the water or emerging from a submersion. The ministrant is always represented as placing his hand upon the head of the subject, or pouring water—sometimes from the hand, sometimes from a vessel—upon the head of the subject. In later representations the vessel is shown, which is sometimes a shallow dish or paten, at other times a jar, or *ampulla*. In some instances the dove, which is usually present, hovering above the head of the subject, holds in its beak the inverted *ampulla*, from which the water pours. It is claimed by the immersionists that these representations are all in harmony with the practice of immersion, and that the act represented in Christian art is the final act or moment when the subject is receiving the

"chrism," or crowning ceremony of baptism. "The artist," says the immersionist, "limited to one moment in the administration of the rite, has chosen to portray the completed act, and consequently we have no representation of the intermediate stages, such as the going into the water or going under the water."

The typical Christian monument used to support this view, in the most recent discussion of this subject,* is the celebrated mosaic in the Church of San Giovanni in Fonte, at Ravenna, which dates from the early part of the fifth century. Christ stands in the water, while John, who holds in his left hand a jeweled cross, extends his right hand over the head of the Saviour, holding in it a shallow dish or vessel from which something is evidently poured upon the Lord's head—"oil of the chrism," says the immersionist. Above floats the dove, symbolizing the presence of the Holy Spirit. In some of the representations of this mosaic the contents of the vessel are seen falling upon the head of the Saviour, but the most recent photographs show merely the extended hand holding the dish. Yet the presence or the absence of the falling contents is not important. The immersionist holds that this dish is the paten which held the sacred chrism, that it was not water which is poured from it, and that there is never in these representations of baptism the pouring of water, but the act of chrism, the completing ceremony in immersion.† Now, concerning this mosaic recent criticism has much to say. Dr. Osgood in the article already noticed remarks: "The very fact that this picture has remained the pattern of similar representations to the present day is a testimony to its high artistic value and power. Until something better has been invented this mosaic will continue to be regarded as the great masterpiece." He also states that it was after this that Giotto copied his picture of the baptism, in the Church of Maria Del Arena, in Padua—a statement made by Richter in his discussion of the mosaic.‡ But careful study of this picture by eminent archæologists shows that it has been greatly restored, so greatly as to destroy its

* Howard Osgood: "The Archæology of Baptism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1899.

† Howard Osgood, *supra*.

‡ J. P. Richter: *Die Mosaiken von Ravenna*. Wien, 1878.

evidential value in the case. Ricci, in Ravenna, and Richter, in his work already alluded to, admit that the neck and right arm of Christ have been restored. Crowe and Cavalcaselle * hold that the head, shoulders, and right arm of the figure of Christ and the same parts of the figure of John, and also his right leg and foot, have been restored. Stryzygowski † holds, further, that the discus held in the hand of John is a restoration from the fourteenth or fifteenth century. The reason for his opinion is that we do not find in Italy or elsewhere previous to the period of the fifth century any representations in which John holds such a discus in his hand. Stryzygowski is followed in the same opinion by Kraus,‡ who affirms that the restoration is so great that we can base no definite conclusions upon it as an original picture. He characterizes Richter's judgment that Giotto copied his picture from it as wholly untenable—"*eine ganz unhaltbare Behauptung.*" These opinions are based upon a careful study of Christian art; their correctness will be seen on further discussion of the subject.

There is one monument previous to the fifth century in which John holds in his hand a vessel similar to that in the Giovanni in Fonte picture. It is a sarcophagus lid in the Lateran Museum, ascribed to the fourth century. It was taken from a Roman cemetery. The subject stands in the water, beneath an overhanging rock from which the water streams upon him. Here for the first time we find the motive of the shallow dish or paten in the hand of the ministrant. But on examining this sculpture we discover that it has suffered restoration in the arm and head of the Baptist and the head of the Saviour. The dish in the hands of the Baptist is evidence of a mediæval artist. Stryzygowski well says, "The restoration according to which John pours water out of a dish upon the head of the Saviour is, according to the analogy of the previous representations, decidedly false." § He further shows that the stream of water pouring from the rock ought to have suggested the true lines of restoration. There is no

* *History of Italian Painting.*
† *Ikonographie der Taufe Christi.* Wien, 1885.
‡ *Geschichte der altchristlichen Kunst*, vol. i, p. 428. Freiburg, 1896.
§ *Opus Cit.*, p. 6.

further representation of such a discus or paten in the hands of the baptizer in Christian art until we come to the fourteenth century. If the San Giovanni mosaic is the pattern for all similar representations, it is marvelous that for a thousand years this particular pattern should be so ignored. We meet with the discus in the fourteenth century and frequently thereafter. One of the earliest instances is in an ivory in the Hotel de Clugny, in France. From this onward it is common, so that we find it in Giotto, Pisano, Perugino, Signorelli, Raphael, and others. Professor Osgood affirms that the discus, as seen in the Giovanni in Fonte mosaic, is the true type, and laments that it has degenerated in the following centuries into the dove holding the inverted *ampulla* in its beak. But, if this is true, why do we find so suddenly in the fourteenth century a reverting to the ancient type? He would say because the old painters copied the mosaic. But why had they not copied it during the past thousand years? It was well known throughout the world of Italian and German art. The San Giovanni type was not a discovery suddenly revolutionizing the Christian art of the fourteenth century. The inference rather is that the fingers of the fourteenth century have tampered with the early mosaic and impressed the fourteenth century type upon it. It is the same influence which restored the Lateran sarcophagus.

This mosaic has not then furnished the typical representation in Christian art of Christian baptism. Far from it. It is undoubtedly a Byzantine picture, but the restoration is not Byzantine. It is, therefore, in the light of archæological criticism not reliable as a type of Christian baptism in the fifth century. In our opinion, the better picture for this purpose and the one which was in all probability modeled after the original, unrestored Giovanni in Fonte, is the baptismal scene in the dome of the neighboring Ravenna Church of Santa Maria in Cosmedin which was built fifty years later and under the same artistic influences. John is here represented as simply resting his hand on the Saviour's head. If the fresco of Giovanni in Fonte, in its present form, is the true type, it is singular that the artist of the mosaic in Santa Maria in Cosmedin, composing his picture of the baptism fifty years

later, should dare to omit such an essential feature as the paten in the hand of John, which indicated the culminating of the baptismal ceremony with the rite of chrism. He has clearly not followed that pattern, but has followed the early type as seen in the catacomb pictures. The two mosaics must originally have been nearly identical in their representation of John's attitude. The discrediting of this celebrated mosaic does away with it as an illustration of baptism by affusion in the fifth century, but illustrations of the practice may be seen elsewhere.

The most ancient picture of the baptism of Christ, according to Wilpert, and one of the finds in Christian archæology of the last decade, is in the catacomb of Petrus and Marcellinus.* The Saviour appears as a young boy. His arms are uplifted in prayer—the only representation in Christian art of Christ as an orant. The hands of the Baptist rest upon the head of the Saviour, who stands in shallow water. Above hovers the dove. A similar fresco, as to the act of baptism, is found in the catacomb of St. Calixtus, in chamber A.† The next great fresco of the baptism of Christ is found in the Chapel of the Sacraments, St. Calixtus, chamber A.‡ It is assigned by De Rossi to the latter part of the second century or the beginning of the third. The subject stands in the water a little above his ankles. The hand of the Baptist rests upon the boy's head, while sprays of water spring from the hand and fall on each side, indicating sprinkling or pouring. The immersionist maintains that these sprays are not water. One interpreter stoutly asserts that they are rays of fire.§ Another questions the integrity of the fresco itself and, referring to the recent critical study of the catacomb frescoes, implies that these sprays of water will be found to be the addition of a later age in the interest of baptism by affusion.‖ We turn again to the brilliant German archæologist who has placed the Christian world under a lasting obligation by his scientific treatment of these monuments. He has discussed the Chapel of the Sacraments of St. Calixtus in a special pub-

* Wilpert: *Die Kat. der Heiligen Petrus und Marcellinus.* Freiburg, 1891.

† *Ibid.*: *Die Malereien der Sacramentskapellen des Heiligen Callistus.* Freiburg, 1897. ‡ *Ibid.* § Armitage: *History of the Baptists.*

‖ Howard Osgood: *Opus Cit.*

lication, in which appears an original photograph of the identical picture. A letter addressed to him asking him whether in his opinion these sprays of water were the addition of a later age brought in return a courteous reply with the statement: "We see here, about the head of Christ, numerous sprays of water, an evident indication of baptism by affusion (*Hier sieht man um den Kopf Christi, eine Menge Wasserstrahlen, ein offenbarer Hinweis auf die Taufe per infusionem*). The same interpretation has been given to this fresco by Stryzygowski, * Dewaal, † Kraus, ‡ De Rossi, § and others.

It is objected that this cannot be sprinkling or pouring, "for who ever saw water spring this way when sprinkled from the hand upon the head? But we must not hold the catacomb artist too closely to the rules of the artist's technique. The cemetery artist is never a proper guide in art canons. He merely suggests. His work is crude at best, but clear enough to tell what he wishes to say. The story he here tells cannot be mistaken, though it is crudely told. The picture is genuine and indicates that affusion or aspersion was part of the ceremony of baptism. We have no evidence in the picture of chrism. If sprinkling was practiced in this case—and this is the only rational interpretation of the picture—then in all probability it was practiced in the other instances, though not indicated by the artist. The picture stands clearly in the way of the theory that baptism is exclusively by immersion and that all representations in Christian art indicate the application of chrism as the crowning ceremony. Hence the impugning of its genuineness and the selecting as a type of the mosaic of Giovanni in Fonte. Professor Osgood remarks concerning this fresco, "If it represents sprinkling it forms the single exception in one thousand years of Christian literature and art."

Let it be conceded that trine immersion was practiced in the second century, as is evidenced by Tertullian and others. The question is whether we have any evidence that aspersion or affusion was in use also. Let us make further inquiry into Christian art. There are in Christian art and literature dis-

* *Opus Cit.*

† "*Die Taufe Christi auf vorconstantinische Gemaelde*," *Römische Quartalschrift*. July, 1896. ‡ *Geschichte der Altchr. Kunst*, vol. i, p. 164. Freiburg, 1896.

§ *Bulletino di Arch. Cristiana*, iv, 4, 19, 20.*

tinct evidences to this fact. There are four notable examples from the fourth century. The first is in the Academia Reale d'Istoria in Madrid.* The baptism of Christ is shown in one of the seven pictures which adorn a sarcophagus. Here we see the subject standing in the water. The hand of the administrant rests upon the head of the subject. From a large vessel on which perches a dove pours a copious stream of water. This is assuredly no chrism, where a little oil is applied to the head. The artist evidently intends to show the pouring of water, from the size of the vessel used. The second example is likewise a sarcophagus, to which allusion has already been made. The discus in the hand of the Baptist is a restoration, but the stream of water pouring from the rock upon the head of the Saviour is a part of the original sculpture. The third example from the fourth century is found in Aquileia. The most accurate copy of it is given in Wilpert's brochure in the *Ephemeris Salonitana.* The subject stands in a shallow font or basin. Upon him from above pours a copious flood of water which seems completely to envelop him. We are told by the immersionist that this flood which pours upon the neophyte is oil, the oil of chrism!

In the eighth and ninth centuries we shall find further evidence. The first picture, as far as we know, in which the pouring of the water and the chrism are distinguished is from northern Italy, in the Church of San Giovanni in Fonte, in Monza. It is ascribed to the year 700. The Baptist holds in his left hand a small vessel containing the sacred oil, as if ready for the chrism which has not yet been applied. He touches the Saviour's head with his left hand. The dove holds in its beak the *ampulla* from which water pours upon the head of the Saviour. Even if we interpret that the hand resting upon the Saviour's head is administering chrism, the vessel above surely indicates the pouring of water.

The same motive is seen in the altar cloth of the Church of St. Ambrose, at Milan, of the year 827, where an attendant standing on a stool lifts a large jar with both hands and pours it over the head of the subject. We notice the same in an Italian ivory from the same period—now in Berlin. That

* Stryzygowski, *Opus Cit.*, p. 6.

this is water and not the chrism appears clearly from the fact that the practice of pouring water in baptism called forth a definite deliverance, it being a substantial rebuke, from the Council of Cellichyt or Calcuit, held 816, which gave the following admonition, "Also let the presbyters, when they perform baptism, know that they are not to pour the water on the heads of the children, but always to immerse the same in the font." * In the light of this admonition we are able to interpret the pictures of the period. It teaches us most clearly that affusion was practiced. What becomes of the statement that the catacomb picture forms the single exception in one thousand years, when we see that a Church council in the early part of the ninth century cautions the presbyters that the right way to baptize is not to pour water on the heads? It substantially says, "Let the presbyters stop the custom of pouring water in baptism."

The pictures of Giotto, Perugino, Signorelli, Raphael, and others were painted at a time when the practice of pouring which we saw rebuked in the ninth century had spread throughout the Church, and their pictures certainly represent this custom, which was then in vogue. We know that affusion or aspersion had become general in the Western Church by the thirteenth century.† The Synod of Ravenna, held in 1311, affirms concerning the rite of baptism, that it may be administered "*sub trina aspersione vel immersione.*" ‡ The restoration of the fresco of San Giovanni in Fonte was probably made at this very period, and surely as the exponent of the teaching of this council, and represents the "*trina aspersione.*" It is seriously to be questioned, according to Kraus, whether chrism is ever represented in Christian art.§ Tertullian and Justin Martyr assure us that it was applied after the act of baptism and the issuing from the font: "After this, when we have issued from the font (*lavacro*), we are thoroughly anointed with the blessed unction." ‖ "They were anointed with the precious ointment after baptism, in remembrance of Him who reputed the anointing of himself with oil

* Hefele: *Conciliengeschichte.*
† Augusti: *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Chr. Arch.*
‡ Hefele: *Conciliengeschichte.* § Kraus: *Gesch. der Chr. Kunst*, vol. i, p. 165.
‖ Tertullian: *De Baptismo*, chap. vii.

to be his burial." * The words, "after the baptism," do not mean after the immersion and while yet standing in the water, but after leaving the font. What then does the stereotyped form of resting the hand on the head signify, in the pictures of baptism? The catacomb fresco under discussion says in effect that it is the act of aspersion accompanied no doubt with the words of benediction; or it may also represent the laying on of hands which was a part of the ceremony.

It is objected that this catacomb picture contradicts the literature of the early Church, which considers baptism by affusion a heresy. But are we to discard as spurious all those representations on the Christian monuments that have no sanction in the literature of the period? Furthermore, the literature of the period is not wanting in the sanction of the representations of affusion in this picture. Justin Martyr (110–165), in chapter lxii of his *Apology*, referring to the imitation of Christian baptism by demons, says, "And the devils, indeed, having heard this washing [baptism] published by the prophets, instigated those who enter their temples and are about to approach them with libations and burnt offerings also to sprinkle themselves; and they cause them also to wash themselves entirely as they depart [from the sacrifice] before they enter the shrines in which their images are set." The sprinkling and the washing are here given, as together constituting the imitation of baptism. We find in Tertullian † an allusion to sprinkling as a part of the ceremony. Speaking of the simplicity of the rite he says, "Without pomp, without any considerable novelty of preparation, finally, without expense, a man is dipped in water, and amid the utterance of a few words is sprinkled and then rises again, not much the cleaner." In chap. xii he remarks:

> Others make the suggestion [forced enough, clearly] that the apostles then served the turn of baptism when, in their little ship, they were sprinkled and covered with the waves; that Peter himself also was immersed enough when he walked on the sea. It is, however, one thing, as I think, to be sprinkled or intercepted by the violence of the sea; another thing to be baptized in obedience to the discipline of religion.

* Justin Martyr: *Resp. ad Orthodox*, 137.
† *De Baptismo*, chap. ii.

In the first quotation we have dipping and sprinkling associated in the one rite. In the second passage we have the implication that sprinkling, as well as immersion, was esteemed baptism. No objection is urged against sprinkling as violating the idea of baptism, but against calling that sprinkling or immersion "baptism," which had not been undergone in obedience to the discipline of religion. We can read through the lines that to the outside world in the second century, in North Africa, sprinkling and immersion were supposed to be parts of the baptismal rite.

Once more, we may cite the conclusion of Cyprian (200–258) in his well-known *Epistle LXXV:*

> Whence it appears that the sprinkling also of water prevails equally with the washing of salvation; and that when this is done in the Church, where the faith both of receiver and giver is sound, all things hold and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of the Lord and by the truth of faith.

It is true that these words refer primarily to the baptism of the sick, but this conclusion of the African father came to have a wider application in the practice of the Church. Cyprian has never been forgiven by some for having made these sensible utterances.

Finally, let us turn to the earliest Church manual, the *Didache*, which may be assigned to the early part of the second century at least. In chapter vii we read:

> Now concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: Having first uttered all these things, baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in running water. But if thou hast not running water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice, into the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

This writer knows nothing apparently about chrism. He does allow liberty in the mode of baptism. It is said that if the catacomb fresco teaches pouring it contradicts the *Teaching*, for this allows of pouring only where there is not sufficient water for an immersion; and furthermore it will be declared that, as the subject in the picture evidently stands in water, pouring would be superfluous and opposed to this

manual of instructions. It is hardly probable that the majority were baptized in "running water," or water brought from streams. Many were baptized in "other water;" many in water "warm" or "cold;" many were poured or sprinkled; but the aim of the catacomb artist was to represent a typical baptism in the time of Christ, which would be in the Jordan. He undoubtedly combined in the picture the local custom of pouring or sprinkling along with the immersion. In interpreting the picture these considerations must be taken into account. Early Christian literature indicates that a large liberty was allowed in the mode of baptism. This liberty has manifested itself in the practice of the Churches. While the Greek Church adhered to trine immersion with great tenacity and to-day practices this mode in all its chief churches, the Coptic and Armenian Churches have recognized the validity of trine aspersion from the earliest period in their history. De Rossi is of the opinion that the performance of the rite of pouring was by no means exceptional in the early Church, and that the catacombs agree with the oldest forms in this matter, as given in the *Didache*. He also maintains that the normal baptism was performed in the early Church by a mode which united immersion and affusion in a single rite, making them separate parts of a repeated ritual.*

Yet, even if we admit that Christian art does represent the act of chrism, there is very clear evidence that the chrism itself may have sometimes been administered with water in the place of the ointment. We have no less an authority than the *Apostolic Constitutions* for this statement. In Book VII, chapter xxii, we read the following concerning the ceremony of baptism:

> But thou shalt beforehand anoint the person with the holy oil and afterward baptize with the water, and in conclusion shalt seal him with the ointment that the anointing with the oil may be the participation of the Holy Spirit, and the water the symbol of the death (of Christ), and the ointment the seal of the covenant. But if there be neither oil nor ointment, water is sufficient for the anointing and for the seal.

It is the opinion of Harnack and others that this part of the *Constitutions*, evidently based upon the *Didache*, belongs to

* Bennett: *Christian Archæology*. Revised ed., p. 453.

the second century.* The liberty allowed certainly recalls the *Didache.* This leads us to the conclusion that chrism was not inevitably performed with ointment. That it was sometimes administered with water is evident. What becomes now of the statement that Christian art never represents the pouring of water in baptism? Even those who hold that chrism is always indicated must acknowledge that water was used. Therefore the representations in Christian art which show the ministrant pouring water on the head of the subject are not contradictory to Christian literature, but are in perfect harmony with it.

* *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii, 246-248.

Amos W. Patten

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

Professor Barrett Wendell, of Harvard, says that "New England developed the most mature school of pure letters which has yet appeared in this country;" and speaks of Emerson as "a writer of unconditioned freedom whose work bids fair to disregard the passing of time, its spirit seeming little more conditioned by the circumstances of nineteenth century Concord or Boston than Homer's was by the old Ægean breezes."

"Each succeeding generation," wrote Goethe, "will renew its youth in the Bible, and the standard for the life and power of a people will be the measure of that people's faithfulness to the precepts of the Bible. Let mental culture increase and science spread and deepen; let the spirit of man broaden as it will—the majesty and the morality of Christianity as it shines forth in the gospels will never be surpassed." Nothing that the great German ever wrote is more manifestly true than this.

A prominent American Catholic clergyman, an astute Jesuit, said one day in Porto Rico, in a moment of candor, in conversation with a Protestant, that it was a good thing for the Porto Ricans that the Spanish priests went home to Spain when the Spanish government officials left the island. And the American priest added, "What Porto Rico needs now is a good batch of Methodist preachers." This is as true of the Philippines as of Porto Rico.

In his *History of the Religious Sentiment Among the Ancient Romans,* Professor Zeller says that the sentiment of awe in the presence of the forest was the only religious sentiment the ancient Romans ever developed. It is a tremendous straining, if not an utter perversion, of language to call that instinctive feeling a religious sentiment. It unfolded, to be sure, in the time of the Roman empire, into the rankest growth of superstitions that the human imagination has ever produced; but surely forest-

awe never carried any man or nation far on the road toward real religion.

In *Alice of Old Vincennes*, Maurice Thompson, who was a minister's son, wrote :

The Church, no matter by what name it goes, has a saving hold on the deepest inner being of its adherents. No grip is so hard to shake off as that of early religious convictions, the still, small voice, coming down from the times "When shepherds watched their flocks by night" in old Judea, passes through the priest, the minister, the teacher; it echoes in cathedral, church, open-air meeting; it gently and mysteriously imparts to human life the distinctive quality which is the exponent of Christian civilization. Upon the receptive nature of children it makes an impress that forever afterward exhales a fragrance and irradiates a glory for the saving of the nations.

Once, when Adam Clarke was trying to steer between opposing parties under criticism, John Wesley wrote him :

Dear Adam : You will want constant supplies of courage and prudence. Very gently and very steadily you should proceed between the rocks on either hand. In the great revival in London my first difficulty was to bring into the proper temper those who opposed the work ; and my next was to check and regulate the extravagancies of those who promoted it ; and this was by far the hardest part of the work, for many of them would bear no check at all. But I followed one rule, though with calmness ; either to bend them or break them. When you act rightly, expect to be blamed by both sides.

Every man who is charged with duties of supervision, direction, and administration must have firmness enough to go steadily forward through criticism and blame, sometimes roughly and severely expressed.

At a Missionary Parliament, in the north of England, early in the present year, one question for discussion was why foreign missions are not more adequately supported by the English people. Mr. F. W. Harrison, a representative of the London Press Association, presented opinions from a number of eminent men, among whom were Dr. Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, whose chaplain wrote from Lambuth Palace, January 15, 1901 : "I am desired by the Archbishop of Canterbury to say that he knows of no reason why foreign missionary work does not receive more sympathy, except the slowness of Englishmen to take up any work whatever save that by which money can be made." Is not this the same as saying that they are not truly Christian ? Christ's call is for men to do from pure love of God and man what worldly and unregenerate men will only do for money.

THE SUICIDE OF GOD.

In the late seventies of the last century seven Japanese boys, schoolmates in a government college in one of the cities of Japan, having been converted to Christianity under the labors of Methodist missionaries, formed themselves into a society which they called a Church. In that small membership, we are told, were seven different types of mind. It does not require a large number of human beings to insure variety. Two have been known to furnish not only variety but virulent contrariety.

Of one of the seven members the following account is given. He was physically nearsighted, perhaps also mentally myopic, and suffered from neuralgia. What seemed reasonable to others often looked unreasonable to him. He was so constituted that he must question everything, and prove things before he could accept them. The name of this suspicious and distrustful lad should have been Thomas, though it was not. With all his scholarly airs and spectacles and doubts, he is said to have been a guileless and gentle-hearted boy. But he often perplexed the mind and cooled the enthusiasm of the incipient Church with his gloomy and seemingly captious skepticism about Divine providence and other momentous matters. In his unhealthy, neuralgic head he manufactured more puzzles and heresies than he or anybody else in that vicinity could dispose of. One of his heterodoxies rose from misreading that mysterious chapter, the ninth of Romans, through spectacles smoked black and blue by hyper-Calvinistic exegesis, which led him to this conclusion, explicitly announced, "If God made one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor, there is no use in trying to be saved; for He will take care of His own, and we shall be saved or damned in accordance with His inscrutable and unalterable decree, notwithstanding all our efforts to be otherwise." A strange, immoral, sacrilegious heresy, indeed, to be adopted and propounded by a Methodist convert!

In view of the multiplicity, gravity, pertinacity, volubility and disturbing effect of his heresies, it was finally deemed best to make a concerted and strenuous effort to settle some of these vexatious and insurgent questions, and silence this troubler of the little Israel; and, to this end, the young Church turned itself temporarily into a theological debating society and focused its intellectual powers on the task of answering the doubter and extricating him from his gloomy conclusions.

The constitutional skeptic, thus formally put on the defensive and standing alone against the phalanx, perhaps with something of the feeling of *Athanasius contra mundum*, showed himself not less but rather more unreasonable, captious, and obstinate, taking a position on the far off-side of nearly every question, even on that of the existence of God. When anybody framed an affirmative proposition and punctuated it with a period at the end, he rubbed out the period and put an interrogation point in its place. The climax of wanton and obstreperous dissent was reached when the six orthodox affirmers had proceeded so far with the job of silencing the ingenious recalcitrant as to have proved, by arguments conclusive to themselves, that this universe must have had a Creator, and that the Creator must be self-existing, all-mighty, and all-wise. Then the nervous neuralgist, driven into a corner but determined not to surrender, contracted his spectacled brows and answered: "I grant that this is indubitably a created universe and that the Creator must have been all-wise and all-mighty, so that nothing could be impossible for Him. But how can you prove to me that this God, after He created this universe and stocked it with forces and set its processes in motion so that it can evolve and grow by itself with the potential energy originally imparted by Him—how can you prove that this Creator has not put an end to His own existence and annihilated Himself? If He can do all things, why can He not commit suicide?"

The incorrigible skeptic felt sure that he had plumped down a poser on the table of debate, and gazed around on his opponents with the air of one who does not know he is beaten. A painful silence fell for a moment on the astounded and nonplussed defenders of the Faith, who simply stared aghast. But in another moment one member of the little Church, who seems to have remembered the directions given for answering a certain class of persons in Prov. xxvi, 5, and who felt the wanton affront to sense and reason contained in the heretic's silly question, gathered his wits and indignantly blurted out the only answer fit and adequate to the occasion, "Well, only fools will ask such questions!"

The little church in Japan is not alone in its experience, and the suicide of God is not the only heresy, which, without any foundation in reason, has had behind it a morbid distrustfulness, a disputatious spirit, a perverse pride of opinion, a cantanker-

ous indocility, a pleasure in the apparent importance gained for oneself by conspicuous differing from the established consensus, and a propensity to worry the saints—one or all of these and similar constituent elements of the cerebral solution out of which multifarious and grotesque heresies crystallize. Indeed, as a general rule, the impeachments which assail the fundamentals of Religion are too frivolous and preposterous to be intellectually respectable.

PROFESSOR WINCHESTER ON THE GOLDEN AGE OF NEW ENGLAND LITERATURE.*

I AM sure there are men here who could speak with more intimate knowledge of the great New England writers than I can; very possibly some of riper years whose good fortune it may have been to know some of them personally. I can only claim a long admiration for their work, and possibly some knowledge of that type of New England character and life which they all represent. For, although my parents removed from the town of my birth so early that I might almost say with the traditional Irishman that "I was never in my native place," they only removed from one New England town to another; I passed all my youth within less than a score of miles of that Burial Hill at Plymouth where rest the ashes of my maternal grandfather seven times removed; my earliest conceptions of the stir and bustle of the great world of men were drawn from visits in my childhood to that Mecca of every New England country lad, Boston—where my paternal ancestor landed two hundred and sixty-five years ago; I learned the dialect of Hosea Bigelow so early and so fatally well that—I dunno as I shall ever unlearn it naow; and all the experiences and memories of my early days are bound up with that type of life in eastern New England which, in some respects so rugged and austere, is yet the soil out of which our noblest literature has grown. I say our noblest literature, because I suppose not even the critic most envious of New England would venture to deny that, in Emerson and Longfellow and Whittier and Holmes and Hawthorne and Lowell, our

*By solicitation we obtained this report of an after-dinner speech, essentially extemporaneous and not intended for publication, delivered by Professor C. T. Winchester at the annual banquet of the New England Society of Brooklyn, N. Y., on December 21, 1900. We present it as spoken, because it seems the more vivacious and effective in the free, off-hand informality of its utterance. For want of space elsewhere in this number of the *Review*, we insert it here. [ED.]

American literature touched the highest excellence it has yet attained. Indeed, I am inclined to think that, without boastfulness, we can say more than that. We may admit that neither of these men, in the combination of those qualities which constitute greatness in literature, is quite the equal of two or three of his contemporaries in England; but I venture to think that not more than twice or thrice in the whole course of English literary history can you find a group of men, gathered about one literary center, bound together by intimate personal friendship, who have produced any body of writings that in freshness of imagination, in racy humor, in vigor of thought, and in power of moral impulse, is superior to that produced between 1845 and 1875 by those six men—Emerson, Longfellow, Whittier, Hawthorne, Lowell, Holmes. They are the leading figures in a school of writers that any country might well be proud of. With them America first gained a distinctive place in the literature of the world; we shall be fortunate if, in the next two generations, we produce, the country over, so large a body of writings so well deserving to live.

But it would be idle to speak any words of mere praise for these men; still less to attempt any critical estimate of their work. I wish rather simply to emphasize the fact—which we may certainly remember with pardonable pride on an occasion like this—that this is a New England literature. To say this implies much more than the mere accident of residence. These men, with the widest differences of individual genius and temperament, all have certain deep underlying similarities of character which are of their blood and inheritance. The history, the tradition, the temper, the very atmosphere of New England is in all their work. Every man of them, whether poet or philosopher, or humorist, or reformer, is first of all a Yankee. Their work cannot be conceived as produced in any other section of the country than New England, nor indeed in New England at any other period than during their generation. Doubtless this is to admit a certain provincial character in their work; and I am aware that some of our more cosmopolitan modern critics are inclined to regard this with a superior regret. But there are worse things than provincialism—in fact, I sometimes think there are not many things better. I like my literature not too far conventionalized—with some flavor of its native sources. At all events, I am sure that the freshest and

most original writers are oftenest those who can find both their motive and their circumstance in the life they ought to know best, the life of their own time and their own society. I suspect any society of being somehow oversophisticated and outworn when I find its writers going too far afield for their themes, or making—as so many of our writers of fiction nowadays do—labored "studies" of eccentric or unfamiliar phases of experience. Our New England writers were not provincial in any narrow or petty sense. Their outlook upon the great truths and the great passions was not narrowed; but they found those truths and passions right at home. In the history and legend of New England was room enough for all romance; in the life of New England, the same wisdom and pathos and inspiration that had made the literature of all the centuries. As Emerson makes old Monadnoc say:

> There's fruit upon my barren soil
> Costlier far than wine or oil;
> . . . . .
> Autumn ripe, its juices hold
> Sparta's stoutness, Bethlehem's heart,
> Asia's rancor, Athens' art,
> Slow-sure Britain's secular might,
> And the German's inward sight.

When men come to see, as these men did, with a kind of glad surprise, that the richest harvests of imagination are to be garnered in the fields that spread around their own door, then you are pretty sure to get a genuinely national literature.

Up to about 1835 the best thought of our people had been given to practical and political matters. We were framing a government and making a society. Of statesmen there was no lack; there were no abler statesmen living than those who framed our Constitution and defended it in the earlier years. And of these, too, New England had furnished her quota. But now, for the first time, and in New England, there was leisure and stimulus for that larger, more contemplative, and imaginative view of life out of which literature must come. Our earlier attempts had been mostly imitative. The *North American Review* was a copy of the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*, and written in their academic manner. The work of Irving was largely, that of Willis almost wholly, copied from the manner of the English essayists. But with the appearance of Emerson's first book, *Nature*, in 1836, and of *The Dial* four years later in 1840, we get something fresh, studied from no original, and inspired

immediately by a new sense of the possibilities of our own life. Says *The Dial*, in its second number: "We have our men of science, our Franklins, our Bowditches, our Cleavelands; we have our orators, our statesmen; but the American poet, the American thinker, is yet to come. Let us but have earnest, whole-hearted, heroic men, and we shall not want for literary fame. Then we shall see springing up in every part of these republics a literature such as the ages have not known—a literature commensurate with our ideas, vast as our destiny, and varied as our theme." If this prediction sounds somewhat large, its loftiness of moral ideal, its confidence in native resource, were certainly of the happiest augury for a new literature. That stir of thought in New England which we call somewhat vaguely the Transcendental Movement was doubtless only one wave of that greater impulse which in the thirties and forties was spreading over England—and indeed over the whole Continent; and which spoke with various voice in Richard Cobden, and Thomas Arnold, and John Henry Newman, and Thomas Carlyle, and John Ruskin, and Alfred Tennyson. But in England this movement was more distinctively one of reform and correction. It was the fever caused by the injection of new ideas, political, industrial, religious, into a system grown lethargic from custom and full of old abuse. There were Reform Bills to be passed, and Poor Laws and Corn Laws to be repealed; there were clamorous Chartists to be pacified or suppressed; there were starving thousands to be fed or colonized abroad in fatter lands. But here in New England there were no venerable wrongs to be righted, no crust of unrighteous custom to be broken up. The difference between the optimism of Emerson and the pessimism of Carlyle—which everybody has noticed—is not due entirely to difference of individual temperament; it is due in part to the different conditions in which the two men lived. For New England between 1830 and 1850 was a place of health and hope; an excellent place in which to grow a literature of sap and vigor. The earliest days of narrowness and isolation were past. The mind of New England had become hospitable to the best thought of every age and clime. We of this later generation can well believe that, as Lowell says, the Cambridge society of his time was the best society of the world. Yet it was still a comparatively simple society, homely, democratic, friendly to plain living and high

thinking. The population was still very homogeneous; there were no very wide differences of wealth or social standing, no hungry or complaining under class. There was general comfort without luxury. Most of the people still lived in the country or near it; you never got far away from the healthy smell of the soil. All the traditions of the section made for a certain plain, good-humored, sturdy independence. Now it was at the period when this New England character was to be seen in its purest, most distinctive form, that this group of writers began their work. There is in all their writing, not only the interest of new themes, but the vigorous originality of youth. Most of them have some of the faults of form that you expect in a new and untutored literature; Hawthorne is perhaps the only one in whom vigor of conception is matched with an almost faultless artistic sense. But they all bring to their subject a certain freshness and eagerness of mind. Read the essays or the verse of Emerson, and the old truths of human life, which sages have said and poets sung since time began, sound like new discoveries. You feel the confidence, the vision, the forward look of a new era.

Never did a literature show the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure, more faithfully than did this. Its themes, its ideals, its mode of thought, its imagery, its forms of speech—they are all of New England. Our very landscape is set in these men's page, with all its austere beauty, its wayward untamed charm—the dear old Yankee birds and flowers, and trees and hills and pastures. As I read I hear again, as all through my boyhood I heard, the purring of the pine trees behind my father's farm, that

> Mope, an' sigh, an' sheer your feelin's so,—
> They hesh the ground beneath so, tu, I swan,
> You half-forgit you've gut a body on.

I see again the bobolink in my father's orchard, as

> Half-hid in tip-top apple-blooms he swings,
> Or climbs aginst the breeze with quiverin' wings,
> Or, givin' way to 't in a mock despair,
> Runs down, a brook o' laughter, thru the air.

And I am ready to agree with Hosea Bigelow, that

> I'd give more for a live bobolink
> Than a square mile o' larks in printer's ink.

In truth, I sometimes doubt whether you can find anywhere in Wordsworth or Scott or Tennyson the actual scene ren-

dered with such loving fidelity, such truth to its very atmosphere as in such passages as these from Lowell, or in Emerson's "Wood Notes," or "May Day," or in Whittier's "Snow-Bound;" while for the union of nicety of observation with poetic feeling, Thoreau's "Walden" is unsurpassed by any similar prose in the language. White's "Selborne" is meagre in comparison.

The dominant tone of feeling, too, in all this literature is very characteristic of New England. It is cool, self-controlled, with a trace of sternness. New England affections are deep, but shy and reticent. You see the inherited Puritan austerity and reserve. In the books of these men there is a high chasteness and purity of feeling; passion, but the passion of the spirit, not of the flesh; no soft luxuriance of manner, no dallying with delights of sense; no hectic or fevered love of beauty; no trace of that disordered sensibility and neurotic temper which taints so much modern writing. This literature is as healthy as the winds that blow around the granite hills of New Hampshire, or the piney breath of the woods of Maine.

Consider, also, how typical of the New England character is the humor of these men. It is of the very essence of humor, I suppose, that it cannot be accurately described; but we may all recognize some distinguishing qualities of the humor of New England. It is a good humor—never bitter or sour; I don't think we have had a New England cynic. Nor is it hilarious, Rabelaisan, or farcical. Your New England humorist never wears the cap and bells. He seldom laughs aloud; but he meets extravagance or sentiment with a look of droll incredulity. He has a certain dry shrewdness, and he will give a homely turn to the sublimest truths. His humor almost always has a moral basis, and seems to consist in some odd contrast between the commonplace and the lofty. "Hitch your wagon to a star!" Who can imagine that said by anyone outside of New England? And is it humorous or is it sublime? You hardly know, for humor of this sort in truth passes insensibly into all forms of serious feeling. Take as an example Lowell's "Bigelow Papers." So far as I can recollect, they are something unique in English poetry. The combination of such a variety of high poetic qualities in a humorous poem is unprecedented. Yet the combination does not seem forced. The exquisite description, bright imagination, delicate sensibility, intense pathos, stirring lyric appeal, are suffused in every line with a humor

which serves to heighten the passion and the beauty of the whole. Many a man cannot read or remember to-day some of those stanzas without feeling again the thrill of solemn assent with which, though only a boy, he read them first:

> God means to make this land, John,
> Clear thru, from sea to sea,
> Believe an' understand, John,
> The wuth o' bein' free.
> Ole Uncle S., sez he, I guess,
> God's price is high, sez he;
> But nothin' else than wut he sells
> Wears long, and thet J. B.
> May larn, like you an' me.

This is the type of humor—varying, of course, with the person and the theme—but always serious, moral, the other face of earnestness, that you will find in all these men—Holmes, Hawthorne, Emerson, and even in Whittier and Longfellow.

And then this literature is typical of New England in that it is so thoroughly democratic. English fiction and poetry in the last century tended to patronize the people, and Wordsworth, at the beginning of our century, in his idealizing of wagoners and peddlers perhaps rather overdid it. But all such writings emphasizes the difference between social classes. In our New England writers, on the other hand, you do not find any sense of social distinction. There are no classes in their work. One of the latest historians of American literature rather amuses me by the pains he takes to prove that our New England writers came of families of excellent blood and breeding; the writers themselves never show any fussy solicitude on that point. All of them, excepting perhaps Whittier, did doubtless belong to families of comfortable wealth and of the best culture of the town. Yet they do not seem to be aware of any distinction between themselves and other people. Some of Lowell's English friends supposed that the dialect of Hosea Bigelow was that of Lowell's father and family circle. Of course it was not, but it was a speech that Lowell knew as well as he knew his mother's tongue and heard every day. It was not the speech of a peasant class elaborately represented. Parson Wilbur and Hosea Bigelow belong to the same social class, and the other name of both is Lowell. And these writers shared all the activities of their fellow-citizens. Emerson never missed his town meeting, and was once, I believe, honored with an election to the position of hog-reeve of the town of Concord

—and accepted it too. The truth is there never was a society that while making room for differences of wealth and culture and intelligence, was more generally democratic, more entirely without any hard lines of caste distinction, than the society of New England from 1830 to 1850. I think the best picture of a healthy democracy that can be found in literature can be found in the works of our New England men, and I am sure that the best defense of democracy that I know of is in Mr. Lowell's famous Manchester Address. It is true that it was comparatively easy then to believe in democracy. The problems of modern society had not yet arrived in New England when Lowell and Emerson and Hawthorne were writing. Life, as one looks back upon it, seems almost ideally strong and simple.

But most of all I hold this literature to be typical of New England in its moral quality. The moral note is dominant in every one of these writers from first to last. Their work was never merely literary, never shut up within the horizon of æsthetic interest. It all has a distinctly ethical motive. It takes a moral impulse of some sort to set the imagination at work. In the case of reformers, in men like Whittier, that goes without saying. Emerson was first of all, not the poet, not the essayist or critic, but the preacher. Some of us were inclined to resent a little Mr. Arnold's patronizing tone in his lecture upon Emerson, yet I believe Mr. Arnold was right in his opinion that Emerson was first of all a guide and helper of those who would live in the spirit. Every one of Hawthorne's tales, and even his novels, is built up about a moral conception. Lowell said, "I shall never be a poet until I get out of the pulpit, and New England was all meetinghouse when I was growing up." Even the most scholarly and academic of the group—Longfellow—exerted his best and deepest influence by his power of moral stimulus. His biographer says of "The Psalm of Life" that young men found their hearts stirred by it as though by a bugle summons. It inspired and enriched their lives. The same was true of most of his earlier and most popular writing. So Holmes in his charming papers is not concerned primarily with merely literary, artistic, or æsthetic matters, but underneath all the delightful humor is a genuine and aggressive moral earnestness. All these men derived from Puritan ancestry. They are of the school of Wither and Marvel and Milton. The training of five generations, the culture and learning of modern life, had

taken all Puritan acerbity and narrowness out of them. Their thought was thoroughly liberated; and yet the aggressive moral temper of the Puritan was in the blood of all of them.

Such, as I conceive them, are some of the characteristics of the only distinctive school of American literature we have as yet produced. We may have something greater in the future; but we shall have nothing exactly like it. For we no longer have such a New England. We have more learning in New England now, perhaps, more wealth, more enterprise; but the old simple, homogeneous society, with its directness of aims, its unity of feeling, that we have no longer. A good many people who belonged in New England have moved away to civilize the outlying districts, and their place has been taken very largely by immigrants of alien race and temper. Much of the interest of Mr. Lowell's admirable work proceeds from the fact that it was a picture of some phases of New England society in the period of its transition from the old times to the new. Nowadays, people who write of New England life are prone to go into the country a good ways, or into the past, and picture some quaint belated types as curious or picturesque; but they do not give us, as those greater writers did, the life of to-day, the life of which they are themselves a part. And I do not find in the literature of the present day any such earnestness of moral conviction and such sense of a message as I do in our earlier New England men. Not until we *do* have again some writers who have something that they *must* say, who look upon literature as something more than a pretty art or elegant recreation, shall we have any literature to match this of the New England men. I expect that greater literature before the end of another century. The very multiplicity and difficulty of the problems that are upon us may delay for a little this expression of our modern life; but the writers will arise who shall be able to set this complex life in the forms of imagination, and to touch those deep moral motives upon which we must more and more depend for the solution of all its problems. But whatever the twentieth century may bring forth, it will be the verdict of all the future that the one eminent and distinctive school of American literature in the nineteenth century was produced in New England, was the expression of the New England character in its purest form, and was represented by Emerson, Whittier, Hawthorne, by Lowell, Longfellow, Holmes.

THE ARENA.

"THE RELIGION OF CHILDHOOD"—W. R. GOODWIN'S CRITICISM.

If the "Arena" will tolerate a three-cornered discussion of this subject, I would like to "shy my castor into the ring." And in doing so I do not in the least assume that Dr. Story needs any help from me for the vindication of his article published in the *Review* for July, 1900, as against the criticisms of Dr. Goodwin in the "Arena" for the current March. If it will tend to make Dr. Goodwin feel pleasant, I shall be glad to say to him, and in the presence of all the readers of the *Review*, that I fully agree with him in so far as he agrees with Dr. Story. But with equal emphasis, and with a purpose not less to promote good feeling, I want to say that, when the doctor came to points where he dissents, it is to be regretted he did not conduct his case on its merits, instead of importing into the controversy the authority of such great names as Fletcher, Wesley, Ames, and Simpson. The latter is not fair, unless one is willing to let authority determine in all cases, which surely Dr. Goodwin would not be; because Mr. Wesley, for instance, believed in witches and put belief in witches and belief in the Bible into the same boat, to sink or swim together. No, unless a man is willing to bear a permanent "extinguisher of thought on his intellect," he cannot do that. In this world of progress the greatest authorities should be living, and the fact that a man is dead should not count.

But now for the real point at issue. The last half of Dr. Goodwin's closing sentence is as follows, "But the line of the new birth must be crossed by every child before he can become the child of God." Now, certainly, that is not what Jesus taught. What he did teach was that they were to come to him, because "of such is the kingdom of heaven," and that men were to "be converted, and become as little children"—not as little children are after they have crossed some line or other. But, now, Dr. Goodwin has to have this "line of the new birth" crossed by children, because he has previously assumed" the fact that we inherited from sinful Adam a tendency to sin," and that, therefore, "the blood of Jesus must cleanse the child from this inherited tendency." But what if this "inherited tendency" be altogether a natural tendency, and not at all a moral one? What if it be the law in the members, according to Paul, or, "the brute inheritance in man," according to evolution—the almost irrepressible physical, not yet completely dominated by the intellectual and the moral?

Such a view voids many difficulties. It is a view that is on the plane of the natural, and the natural must be heard here. For, surely, no one can have thought of this subject seriously who has not seen the difficulty of assuming an inheritance to sin from Adam. Because, if such were the fact, it must be for the reason that there is a law of our

being in virtue of which children in all cases inherit evil tendencies from their parents. That being so, it is a very mild case of inherited evil tendency that the race has from Adam, in comparison with the evil tendency which everyone now coming into the world inherits from the race. Did Dr. Goodwin ever stop to think that, to go back for only thirty-one generations, less than one thousand years, his progenitors—men and women—would number more than all the people now living in the world? If the sin of one man could put the whole race into a lost condition, surely the sins of the race should submerge the individual under a flood of evil tendency beyond hope of salvation.

The great need of the hour is to get rid of every vestige of Calvinism. Our Arminianism, until quite recently, has been more Calvinistic than we knew. There can be no clear thinking for us upon lines of anthropology and soteriology until this most horrid system of thought shall find no longer any function in the matter of vindicating "the ways of God to man." I take these truths to be self-evident:

1. That no man is a sinner except the man who has sinned. That sends out to the theological scrap pile,

> In Adam's fall
> We sinned all.

2. That no man is corrupt except the man who has corrupted himself. That would send out to the same pile,

> Sprung from the man whose guilty fall
> Corrupts his race, and taints all.

3. That no man can be righteous except he who "doeth righteousness." This makes man's salvation a real thing, and not a fiction.

4. That no man can be put in moral peril by having charged up to him an evil inheritance through the fault of another. That would make our religion ethical—he should no longer be "throwing things above which are wrong here below."

5. The child, being not in peril from the wrong of another, and having done no sin itself, is "of the kingdom of heaven" already. That recognizes relations as they are, and gives us a God whom we can worship, which, indeed, is a great necessity.

These five statements, all of which I verily believe to be true, have proved to me to be a very snug little theological kit—one which I can take with me to church, on the railroad train, and wherever I go. I hope it may be to others what it has been to me—a help to feel that there is a goodness in God's justice, as well as a "wideness in his mercy."

Minneapolis, Minn. J. F. Chaffee.

A WORD FOR LUCIAN.

The very interesting article by Professor Taylor, of Boston University, in the *Review* for September, 1900, on Lucian's attitude toward Christianity calls for some additional statement. It was hardly fair to use

the *Philopatris* to make out a case against Lucian, and then to throw doubt upon the Lucianic authorship of the piece. In reality it bears no testimony whatever as to what Lucian thought of Christianity. J. M. Gesner, in a work published at Göttingen in 1730, *De Philopatride Lucianeo Dialogo Dissertatio*, definitely relieved Lucian of all responsibility as the author, upon internal evidence (compare also Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexicon*, s. v. Gesner). A. S. Farrar says, "The work hardly merits an analysis." No fair-minded writer could so estimate a work undoubtedly written by Lucian.

A distinction should be made between the genuine works of Lucian and those not genuine. Not all that is bound in with Lucian is of Lucian. A careful study of the works undoubtedly written by the author in question has led the present writer to two conclusions:

1. Lucian requires no more expurgation for modern readers than Shakespeare or Dean Swift. What is more to the point is that there is in him none of that reveling in impure imagery which we find in the great English satirist. There was no bitterness in his hatred of shams, no personal animus in his criticism of the ways of men. He is sane and hopeful to the end. As to his personal attitude to the Christian faith and creed, both he and Swift lived within the Christian era; but, though Swift lived and died within the fold of the Church and Lucian without that fold, as far as works of righteousness are concerned, in any comparison, one will not suffer more than the other. His authentic references to the Christians are not necessarily antagonistic. In the *Alexander, the False Prophet*, he classes Christians and Epicureans together. But it was as enemies of the false, sensual imposition which Alexander, who is an historical character, had practiced upon the credulity of the people of Pontus. One who will read the *Alexander* will not censure an alliance in a cause so good. It makes one think there must have been some elements of good even in Epicureans. The *Proteus*, Lucian's chief offense, is probably a delineation of some actual impostor. One may learn from Rev. ii, 2, that there were such.

2. As a literary interpreter of the life of men in the subapostolic age Lucian has no peer, and scarcely a rival. By cosmopolitanism he outshines any Greek or Roman of the first two Christian centuries. He pictures for us men and women in all the common walks of life. I will venture to say that upon no other pages than those of Lucian shall we find so varied and sympathetic a picture of the multitude which the Christian Church sought after in the era of her early triumphs. The *Dialogues of the Courtesans* is no *Decameron*, but the story of the intensely human experiences of an unfortunate class of women. In Acts xvii, 18, certain Epicurean and Stoic philosophers ask, of Paul, "What would this babbler say?" (this "σπερμολόγος," this "picker up of seeds"). We do not find this word in the text of Lucian; but it is an echo of the furious logomachies described in Lucian's *Eunuch* or *Zeus the Tragedian*. What Paul thought of such a waste of useful energy he makes plain in

2 Tim. ii, 14, "charging them in the sight of the Lord, that they strive not about words, to no profit, to the subverting of them that hear."

In the *Hermotimus* we have the story of Lucian's life, singularly like the experience of Justin Martyr, up to the point where the latter met the guide who turned him to Christ. Surely we may not lay it to Lucian's charge that we cannot tell whether or not any such kindly messenger ever met him. He compels the belief that he was one of, at least, the better spirits of his age, and that he did set himself in a sincere way of his own against the evil he found in the world.

Portland, Conn. WESLEY WOOD SMITH.

"WHAT CREATED GOD?"

THERE is an excellent article in the January number of the *Review* under the title, "Some Questions that Evolution Does Not Answer." On page 35 the inquiry is asked, "What Created God?" the treatment of the point being very unsatisfactory. We recall that Joseph Cook in one of his lectures touches on the same point, and leaves the question in about the same condition, quoting the answer of some one who replied to substantially the same quibble, "If my argument proves the existence of an infinite number of Gods, so much the worse for you."

It is a question long ago injected into the inquiry after the "first cause." However, the question is sprung too late, when the first cause is announced, that is, logically discerned. There the mind rests; there can be no "infinite series." The series which the seeker followed proved to be finite; and it led him, not to an infinite series, but to an infinite God, who is the only cause of the finite series.

We reach a similar result from the view point of the dependence of the material universe. It is dependent. We gather our perception of this condition of all finite things into the term, "the dependent." The idea expressed by this term comes clearly before the mind; but with it merges also another idea equally clear, the idea of "the independent." Each is as distinct and authoritative as the other. Both are axiomatic. In each case a something real corresponds to the idea. Back of the idea of the dependent is all the universe of finite things. They exist. Only the insane doubt their realness. Back of the idea of the independent is a Being measuring up fully to the mind's conception of it. The existence is real. A healthy mind does not doubt its realness any more than it doubts the validity of the axioms of science.

The independent is necessarily uncreated and eternal. Of it we may affirm all the attributes of the Deity; for they are "clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal powers and Godhead." Paul was not ranting. There is but one Independent. There can be no other. Incomprehensible? Yes. The mountain reaches far above the clouds; but we see it resting on its stupendous base, and, assured that the top is in the sunlight, our logic is satisfied.

Burlingame, Kan. R. E. MCBRIDE.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

THE PRESERVATION OF INTELLECTUAL VIGOR IN THE PULPIT.

In order to intellectual force in the pulpit there must be a corresponding vigor out of it. A preacher whose mind has become inactive will soon show to others in his public address that it is impaired. Inaction in any organ, whether physical or intellectual, tends to deterioration and decay. This law, so well understood in worldly matters, should not be lost sight of by the preacher. Rev. Mr. A., for instance, was once a powerful preacher; but after a time people wonder why he is no longer so, although he is yet in the prime of his physical vigor. He himself is surprised at the apparent change in appreciation of his public administrations. The same sermon which years ago aroused sinners and encouraged saints falls upon listless ears. But the reason, which perhaps he does not suspect, is that the intellectual and spiritual energy which accompanied the first delivery of the discourse has departed. The words are the same, but the flash and life have gone. His intellect has not been kept awake. His mental powers are dulled by disuse, and hence the first effect cannot be expected to follow his public efforts. Mere words are destitute of power. The life must be in them, and there can be no power even in delivery when intellectual vigor has departed. The people demand genuine life—not the vigor of noise or bluster, but the deep-seated energy which is apparent even when most quietly expressed.

The preacher may well inquire, then, how intellectual vigor is to be preserved. It cannot be maintained unless the mind is kept active. Any organ of our bodies deteriorates by disuse. Movement is the law of progress. The repetition of a sermon, if the minister has simply memorized it, does not call forth intellectual energy, and hence its powerlessness. This does not lie so forcibly against those repeating the same discourse substantially, if they accompany the delivery with fresh thinking and fresh feeling. It is not necessary that one's activities be always employed in the same direction; indeed, it is best that he vary the form, both of intellectual production and of thinking. He even gains by those studies which call forth the reasoning faculties when no positive point is to be proved or enforced. This is true of the study of mathematics. It is well known that the reading over of a few geometric problems or the careful analysis of some argument on any subject prepares the mind for effective service in any practical line which is under consideration. The hands and the feet, unemployed, become weak and powerless; the mind, unemployed, loses vigor. Hence, it must be kept wide-awake by all the processes which are calculated to develop and strengthen it, and among these use is a prime factor.

Intellectual vigor may further be preserved by discovery—that is, the

constantly ascertaining of some new fact or truth and its presentation in fresh forms. The mind is in its very nature desirous of ascertaining things hitherto hidden from it. A new truth or principle or a new fact multiplies, so to speak, intellectual ability, as well as knowledge. Staleness of thought is a vice which should be avoided, and this can be best accomplished by constant interest in what is going on in the world and by grasping new thought with the intensity with which the miser grasps a new coin. Especially is this the case in the study of the Scriptures. The preacher is to bring out of the treasure house of sacred truths things old and new. There are fresh thoughts ever coming to his notice. There are new interpretations of words, fresh analyses of sentences, new forms of expression which constantly call forth intellectual effort. If one could gain a knowledge of all truth without effort, it would be a misfortune. Vigor of intellect is closely connected with freshness of study and the recognition of having found something that one has not known before which is calculated to impress others. New books, fresh and striking articles on important subjects preserve intellectual vigor long after the physical powers have become weakened.

The same result may be secured through the stimulus following from the wide reading and the profound study of the great authors, whether new or old. Some have held that only old books, which have been tried and tested, should be read. This is a mistake. Great books are ever making their appearance; not frequently, it is true, but often enough to furnish something worthy of study and thought on the part of the preacher. Contact with great books is like contact with great master minds through personal communication. A book so far above one that it is necessary to put forth all one's mental energies to comprehend it is for this reason worthy of study, if it be on a matter of interest and importance. It is well understood that in all professions men preserve their strength by reading and rereading the great treatises. There are some books which have been nourishers of successive generations. Bacon will not die, nor Plato, nor Aristotle; they are ever fresh to the real student. The great theological works also afford such stimulus as we are now speaking of—the writings of Augustine and Calvin, of Wesley and Chrysostom—not to refer to those of modern times which are constantly within reach.

Intellectual vigor may also be preserved by care for physical health. "A sound mind in a sound body" is an all-important maxim. It is true that vigorous minds are often found resident in feeble bodies, but a healthy body is the best home in which a healthy intellect can live. Mental vigor, then, involves the preservation of one's health. Failing physical strength often causes the decadence of intellectual vigor, and in many cases it is a cause which the individual cannot remedy. On the other hand, careful attention to the laws of life and health will often preserve to old age a vigorous body, and thus aid in preserving for a long period a vigorous mind.

There is another mode of promoting intellectual vigor which must not be overlooked, namely, that of constantly keeping in view the greatness of the preacher's work. To lose a sense of the dignity of the ministerial profession tends to destroy intellectual energy. One will not pour forth his best powers for that which he thinks does not deserve them. The recognition of the magnitude of the preacher's calling is a stimulus sufficient to incite all the powers, intellectual, spiritual, and physical, with which he is endowed. If one should go to a small congregation and think, "Here is a place where I need not put forth my best efforts," he will soon lose interest and power; but if, on the other hand, he regards the smallest schoolhouse in which a few people congregate as a place where the learning of an Erasmus and the eloquence of a Chrysostom may find fitting scope he will grow, even in the apparently most insignificant field. In God's sight there are no poor appointments. Often the charge which we, in our blindness, regard as unworthy of us will be found to be deserving of higher talents perhaps than we possess. The constant recognition that every place to which God calls us is a great place and that every service we are called to render is a great service because it is for him will be an incentive sufficient to keep alive our intellectual powers when age has come upon us and our physical strength has become diminished.

It is sufficient, then, to say that it is within the power of everyone to maintain his intellectual vigor, if the proper means are used. If, with diligence and fidelity to duty, we live amid the grandeurs of our vocation and amid the intellectual productions of the mighty minds of the past and present; and if, at the same time, we keep close to God in our spiritual life, intellectual vigor may be maintained down to declining years.

THE HOMILETIC VALUE OF THE LATE REVISION—II. Rom. ii, 12. 13; iii, 20.

A comparison of these passages as found in the King James Version and the late Revision deserves consideration for exegetical and also for homiletical reasons. We have already spoken of the force of the presence or absence of the article. In the general usage of this epistle the word "law" with the article—namely, "the law"—refers to the Mosaic law; without the article, to law in general. Thus interpreted, the passage as it is rendered in the King James Version means that "as many as have sinned in the law"—that is, in the Mosaic law—"shall be judged by the law"—that is, by the Mosaic law; for "not the hearers of the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"are just before God, but the doers of the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"shall be justified." This version, therefore, clearly regards the apostle as having in view only the law as given in the Old Testament; whereas, the late Revision broadens the scope of the word "law" by speaking of law in general. Wherever there is

law there is judgment upon those who transgress it. In no case, whether in the revealed law of the Old Testament or in the law of nature, can the hearers of law be just before God. It is only doers of law who shall be justified. We cannot fail to notice here that the apostle is asserting a great principle—that all law, whether the revealed law through Moses, or law as written on the consciences of men, must be obeyed in order to secure acquittal and approval. There can be no exemptions from obligations to obedience, wherever there is a recognition of law. The text, however, does not assert whether there is justification by law or not, but only asserts a principle that they who can be justified by law must be doers of law and not hearers merely.

The paraphrase of this passage by Sanday brings out its general meaning: "Do not object that the Jew has a possession of privilege, which will exempt him from this judgment, while the Gentile has no law by which he can be judged. The Gentiles, it is true, have no law; but as they have sinned, so also will they be punished without one. The Jews live under a law, and by that law they will be judged, for it is not enough to hear it read in the synagogues—that does not make a man righteous before God. His verdict will pronounce righteous only those who have done what the Law commands." By "no law" we understand the author to mean "no law which the Jews regarded as law."

In the twentieth verse of the third chapter of Romans the apostle states a general conclusion. In the King James Version it is declared that "by the deeds of the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"there shall no flesh be justified in his sight. for by the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"is the knowledge of sin." The late Revision, however, has here an alternative reading. In the text there is placed the phrase, "because by the works of the law," but in the margin we read, "works of law," following strictly the Greek. Further, "for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin" is in the text; whereas, in the margin we read, "through law." It would seem difficult to affirm that a knowledge of sin comes through the medium of natural law. Naturally it is supposed that any violation of the law which was revealed through Moses would bring a knowledge of sin, but that there is nothing in law as it is revealed in nature to indicate that a violation of the same would bring a consciousness of sin. A reference, however, to the first chapter of Romans in the Revised Version will relieve our embarrassment. We are there told that "the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse." Here it is evident that the invisible attributes of God have become manifest through creation, namely, his power and divinity—thus affording a basis for Paul's statement that law brings a consciousness of sin, inasmuch as this law of which he is speaking is a revelation of God's power and divinity. In either case God is revealed. In the one case he is revealed through the Old Testament revelation; in the other, in the natural world. The violation,

therefore, of either law should bring a sense of sin and of consequent condemnation, and constitutes men inexcusable in his sight. Upon this point Shedd has said: "An unwritten revelation of the supreme Being himself involves an unwritten revelation of his law. The law of conscience compared with the written law differs from and is inferior to it in the following respects: 1. It is less specific; 2. It is more exposed to honest doubts in particular cases; 3. It is more liable to corruption and alteration; 4. Its sanctions are less explicit. Notwithstanding these deficiencies, however, the unwritten law is sufficiently clear to be transgressed, and sufficiently authoritative to constitute its transgression a sin."

For homiletical purposes these texts open to us great principles, namely: First, men are to be judged by the law which they have, no matter whether they have been favored with the revealed law, as was the case with God's ancient people, or whether they are dependent on the law of nature. In either case the law which they have constitutes the basis of approval or condemnation. Second, it is further affirmed that the possession of law does not constitute a ground of justification, but that the performance of its requirements is essential to legal justification. Doing, and not hearing only, is an absolute requirement. The possession of privileges, therefore, will not bring us to salvation, unless we ourselves make use of them. Third, obedience to the requirements of the law constitutes no ground of justification before God. The perfection of the divine law and the imperfection of our own nature are such, even under the gracious manifestations of God's love that absolute obedience to the divine law is impossible. We may have the spirit of obedience, but the fact of obedience in every detail is not such as to constitute it a ground of approval before God from any legal standpoint—though this does not imply that obedience to law could not justify, if such obedience were complete, but that "no man's obedience of the law is adequate to justify him." There can be no justification on this basis, as the language of the text indicates. Shedd remarks upon Rom. ii, 13: "There is no conflict here with the doctrine of justification by faith. The writer cites an axiom in ethics, namely, that personal obedience will be recognized and rewarded by that impartial Judge who is no respecter of persons, and that nothing short of this will be. That any man will actually appear before this tribunal with such an obedience is neither affirmed nor denied, in the mere statement of the principle. The solution of this question must be sought for elsewhere in the epistle." Fourth, the text further affirms the mission of law. It is to reveal to us a knowledge of sin. It shows us our own defects, our inconsistencies. It makes known to us clearly our transgressions of the holy law of a holy God, and that God cannot look upon sin with allowance, because it is antagonistic to his own holiness. Thus the text unfolds to us the helplessness through the medium of law to gain approval of God, and opens the way for the apostle's great discussion of salvation only by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

CRETAN DISCOVERIES.

SEVERAL years ago Mr. Arthur J. Evans made some important discoveries in the island of Crete, and then announced that he had found on seal stones, on a libation table, and on some rocks marks which he believed to belong to some system of writing different from anything then known to the science of epigraphy. Encouraged by these discoveries, Mr. Evans has kept up his investigations in Crete since 1894, with satisfactory progress all along. But the result of this year's excavations has been very great, for, having obtained permission by the government and aided by the Cretan Exploration Fund, excavations were made at Cnossus, the capital of the island, where the early kings of Crete resided. Mr. Evans believes the ruins to have been those of the palace of Mycenæan kings of about 1400 B. C. The fresco and carving, though nearly three thousand years old, are exceedingly beautiful, superior to anything of the time yet found on the mainland of Greece. The royal bathroom is also quite unique.

But the style of architecture, with the loud testimony it bears to the advanced Cretan civilization, is eclipsed by the fact that a number of inscribed clay tablets have been found in the rooms already examined. What the rest of the ruins may produce can only be a matter of conjecture. These tablets resemble in shape those of Babylonia and Assyria; they are of different sizes, from two to seven inches long and from half to three inches in breadth. The script, however, is different from any system yet deciphered. These tablets prove conclusively that the Cretans possessed their own system of writing, at least six hundred years before the Phœnician alphabet had been introduced. "These inscriptions," says Mr. Evans, "are the work of practiced scribes, following conventional methods and arrangements, which point to long traditional usage. Yet this development has been arrived at on different lines; it is neither Babylonian nor Egyptian, neither Hittite nor Phœnician; it is the work on Cretan soil of an Ægean people." The discoverer is inclined to the belief that the tablets are palace accounts, and bases this opinion upon the fact that many of the forms and signs are repeated upon the various tablets. The more we explore, the clearer it becomes that there is no improbability that the Hebrew civilization suggested by the Pentateuch and early tradition was a reality. Indeed, explorers like Mr. Evans may yet restore Minos to us. What, after all, if Minos and Menes and Moses were historical characters?

More recently, in pursuance of his labors, other discoveries of unusual importance have been made by this veteran archæologist, which many believe to be among the most remarkable and important finds of the age, and which will certainly furnish a new chapter, if not in the story of

European civilization, yet in the history of writing. Mr. Evans published his discoveries in recent numbers of the *Athenæum* (London). In these communications he very fully describes the work done by him and others in the island of Crete during the past season. The explorations were made in Cnossus, the capital of the earliest Cretan kings. The results, as gathered from this brief correspondence, have been eminently satisfactory—far beyond the most sanguine expectations of the promoters of the Cretan Exploration Fund. We are told that the closing days of the work were crowned with unparalleled success. For several chambers and corridors of the royal palace contained inscribed tablets, and one room especially, which was at the extreme end of a very long corridor, had no less than one thousand inscriptions much more perfect than anything found up to that time, "and not a scrap of anything later than the fourteenth century B. C." The tablets have characters upon them, or, as Mr. Evans says, they are in a "linear and highly developed script," with an occasional pictorial form. These tablets, like those of Babylon and Assyria, are of clay, varying in size from two to seven inches in length, and from a half to three inches broad. Most of them are ruled, some having no less than eighteen lines, though most only two. These latest discoveries will aid materially in tracing the development or evolution of the Cretan script, of which we now possess abundant material, and which may now be divided into at least three well-defined specimens: (1) The hieroglyphic, or pictorial; (2) the mixed, or a specimen between the pictorial and the linear; (3) the linear, or, shall we say, alphabetic?

The examples reproduced in the *Athenæum* are of great interest to the student of epigraphy, though, so far, not a line can be read. It is greatly to be hoped that further explorations will bring to light some bilingual or trilingual texts, and thus furnish the key which will unlock these secrets of the distant past. But, while this key is yet to be found, from the pictorial signs and some oft-repeated marks Mr. Evans thinks that many of the tablets have reference to the war department, while others are tax lists or government accounts.

Besides the tablets large numbers of other articles were found by Messrs. Evans and Hogarth on the Kephala site. Among these were some exquisite vases in stone and metal, rings, jewelry, statuettes, axes, knives, and other weapons. Nor must we forget to mention the magnificent fresco work, painted heads, and numerous terra cottas. Many of the objects are daintily decorated in various colors, as well as inscribed with characters like those on the tablets. The numerous articles impressed show that the Cretans were skillful in making seals and gems. Mr. Evans regards the life-size figure of a bull in *gesso duro* as "the finest piece of plastic work of the Mycenæan age yet discovered" and the frescoes as excelling all others painted at that time. The letter form of the inscriptions is also, in his judgment, unsurpassed by any form of later writing.

THE UNITED STATES AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

We have from time to time called attention to the interest of the American people in archæological researches. This interest is constantly increasing, as is evidenced in various ways; and it is only a question of time before our larger cities and great universities will have museums of equal value and prominence with the best institutions of the kind in Europe. The large collections which have been brought to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other cities are already not only attracting great attention, but are also proving very helpful to the student of ancient history. Professor Haupt, of Johns Hopkins, speaking on the subject has said, "If the plan can be carried out in the proper way we may be able to bring to this country a collection of Babylonian antiquities, elucidating the dawn of civilization and especially biblical archæology, not inferior to the oriental treasures of the British Museum, the Louore, or the Royal Museum of Berlin." The great work done in Babylonia by the University of Pennsylvania, under the direction of Professor Hilprecht and others, and the large number of archæological objects secured by them for the museum at Philadelphia are too well known about to be repeated here. The readiness with which several American gentlemen have contributed of their means to facilitate exploration and excavation in Bible lands is also a matter of congratulation. Indeed, it is said that one of the richest men in the United States has encouraged a certain society to prosecute archæological work in the mounds along the Euphrates regardless of expense. If this be true more antiquities may be expected during the next twenty years than have been yet discovered.

It is with great pleasure that we call attention to a new enterprise which its promoters call "A National Expedition, for the purpose of excavating the ruins of the traditional home of Abraham, Ur of the Chaldees." Ur, by common consent, is represented by several large mounds on the western side of the Euphrates, which the Arabs call "Mugheir." Though explorers have for the past fifty years devoted more or less attention to this ancient site, little or no scientific excavations have been made. Yet travelers and explorers who have visited these mounds report that inscribed articles and objects of great interest are lying on the very surface. This is partially explained by the fact that the natives have pulled down some of the ancient walls in order to obtain the bitumen or pitch which they find between the bricks or stones. Indeed, the word "Mughier" means "cemented with asphalt or bitumen." Professor Peters, in his *Nippur* (vol. ii, p. 300), says, "I have seen no mound which seems easier or safer to excavate, or promises greater results." When Mr. Taylor, British consul at Busreh, made some superficial excavations at this place, more than half a century ago, he succeeded in tracing the ruins of a huge temple of the Moon-God, "a perfect monument of Babylonian architecture," and from under the four corners of one of its towers brought to light four very fine cylinder-

inscriptions. He also found in an ancient grave in the same vicinity not only the skeleton of a man, but also several interesting articles, such as vessels in clay and in bronze, an inscribed seal, a band of pure gold nearly an inch in width, and several stones carved so as to represent different objects. This was more than fifty years ago, and yet, strange to say, mounds so rich in material and promising such large returns have remained practically untouched all these years.

The friends of this new enterprise, including some of the most learned men in the country, have selected Dr. Edgar James Banks, formerly United States consul at Bagdad, as the proper man to superintend the work. It is estimated that at least twelve thousand five hundred dollars will be needed to open up the work during the first year, the amount being used to pay the salaries of two Americans, a Turkish commissioner, an interpreter, and a force of one hundred Arab workmen. We shall await with eagerness for the results of this expedition, the more so since a very large number of the objects discovered are to be brought to the museums of this country.

AMERICAN SCHOOL AT JERUSALEM.

The American School of Oriental Study and Research proposed for Palestine, though not yet largely endowed, is making such satisfactory progress that the managing committee, through its chairman, Professor Thayer, of Harvard, has offered a fellowship of $500 for the year 1901–2. The candidates for this fellowship will be subjected to a competitive written examination, the results of which will in the main determine the successful candidate, though other qualities and "attainments on the part of the candidates will be taken into consideration." No one who has not a baccalaureate degree from some reputable college or university will be entitled to compete. Moreover, every applicant for this fellowship must have a fair knowledge of at least four languages, namely, Greek, Latin, German, and French. Besides these qualifications the candidate should have an elementary acquaintance with Hebrew, Syriac, and modern Arabic, as well as a general idea of the geography of the Holy Land and the topography of the leading cities, with some knowledge of the history of the country from the beginning to the present time. This is a move in the right direction, and it is a pity that every theological seminary is not able to offer one such fellowship every year, as it would encourage the very best talent in our schools to pursue archæological, historical, and kindred studies as nothing else could do.

We may also add that when this new school shall have been fully established great attention will be paid to explorations, and duly organized archæological trips under the guidance of competent instructors will be made into various parts of the Holy Land. The matriculates of of this school are expected to have the degree of A.M. or B.D. from some recognized institution.

MISSIONARY REVIEW.

THE MISSIONARY AS A PACIFICATOR IN CHINA.

WHAT the future *status* of the missionary in China will be is, just now, a question on which no one seems to throw much light. The representatives of the allied powers have not yet attempted to grapple with the matter. In fact, they have not yet asked the Chinese authorities for any confession that they have done anything wrong in the disturbances of the year nineteen hundred, nor have they drawn from them any promise that the uprising may not be repeated at any hour hereafter; and, much less, have they come to any understanding among themselves as to how they will approach the missionary question, when the time for its consideration shall come. In short, they have as yet done little or nothing that looks to the pacification of the Chinese, except to seek to strike terror into them. This is all they have yet accomplished that tends to secure the freedom or the safety of foreigners, and it is to be doubted if this ameliorates the situation in the least.

It is uncertain if missions will be advanced to greater security for more than a brief period by alliance with these political forces, and it is possible that the only real pacification lies at last with the missionary himself. Strangely enough, this suggestion comes from a Buddhist source at this time. We have, for the first time in history, the remarkable instance of an appeal by Buddhists to the whole Christian world through the representatives of six principal Buddhist sects in Japan. While they leave diplomats to deal with the task of extricating the civilized powers from their present difficulty in China, they are frank to say that they are "fully convinced that the work of eradicating evil and consolidating the permanent peace and welfare of China must be placed in the hands of the propagandists of religion." They make handsome reference to Christian missionaries, saying that during the past ten centuries they have sailed to China, notwithstanding its great distance, and "with one heart exerted their energies for the propagation of their doctrine and the development of Christian civilization." As teachers of the Golden Rule they declare that "we, the followers of Buddha, cannot sufficiently express our sincere admiration for them." They are frank and generous enough to admit that, though the Japanese Buddhists have had a propaganda in China, they "have not yet been able to achieve anything worthy of notice, and are ashamed of their inability to follow in the steps of, and bring about the result secured by the occidental Churches in the middle kingdom." The missionary force in China may be gratified to have testimony from such a source that their work has been "absolutely indispensable for the development of civilization" in China, and that "the zeal and sincerity displayed by them are really extraordinary."

To accomplish the pacification of China by religious influences these Buddhists propose that there shall be less antagonism between religious representatives themselves, since all religions tend to conserve society, and since at bottom—as they see it—the higher classes of religion, while differing in tenets and rites, "are in all cases essentially, if not entirely, analogous," since they "are based upon the principle of love for mankind." This is a distinct proposition, in effect, that Buddhism and Christianity hold the key to the pacification of China, if they will only form a coalition—which from a Christian standpoint is impossible.

But the other proposition, while perhaps as nearly impracticable, is suggestive of a principle about the working of which the Christian missionary force is divided. These Buddhists particularly inveigh against the Roman Catholics for claiming an official *status* for certain missionaries in China, and for interfering between Christian converts and lawfully constituted Chinese officials. That these Roman Catholic missionaries will yield these privileges is not at all probable, since France has found in them a great means of power over the entire Chinese state, which she values perhaps equally with her possessions in Tonquin.

The only thing remaining which is worth debating refers to what these Buddhists think equally reprehensible and opposed to pacification, namely, the relations between the Protestant missionary and the consul. This has to do with territorial aggression as the Roman Catholic has to do with internal civil jurisdiction. Powers under pretense of exacting reparation for outrages against teachers of Christianity have impressed the Chinese that the missionary is a political pioneer, "followed by a consul with a general at his back;" and "behind the man with a Bible in his hand stands a warrior armed with spear and sword." It is natural, therefore, that these Buddhist representatives should entreat all Christian ecclesiastical authorities in the world "to exercise their interference to restrain the missionaries from proceedings likely to create suspicion of their secret connection with the foreign policy of their own countries," in order that "the honest people of China may be induced to lay aside suspicion and apprehension, and to appreciate with delight the intrinsic virtues of religion."

It is to be said that some Protestant missionaries have abstained wholly, and a still larger number almost wholly, from bringing their affairs to the attention of the consuls; and many of them do not now desire that the allied powers shall do anything about the missionary question. Some of them believe an absolutely noncombative, if not politically a nonprotective, policy would put them at greater advantage to reach the Chinese, while others believe they would not have their heads on their shoulders an hour if the Chinese did not fear the political penalty. It seems quite certain that the missionary is, as the Buddhist priests say, in the possible attitude of a great pacificator, and should recognize the responsibility of the crisis. Rev. W. M. Upcraft, of China, inclines to favor the proposition of the allied representatives

that, as they cannot agree on points relating to the missionary question, they leave it out altogether, and thinks it better that "missions should not be explicitly connected with demands that must forever rankle in the minds of the most apathetic Chinamen."

RELIGION OF STUDENTS IN JAPAN.

An inquiry into the religious proclivities and tendencies of the young men of a nation, especially among those likely to become leaders, as represented by the students in higher educational institutions, would be interesting in any country. It becomes emphatically so when instituted in a land where a variety of religions exist and the population is in a state of religious transition, as is the case in Japan at present. Sixteen gentlemen of Japan somewhat recently addressed a series of questions to the students of the universities and higher schools in the empire which were designed to shed light on the religious conditions of the home, the school, and the changing phases of the thought of the times. These questions were as follows: "1. Do you believe in religion? Are you at liberty to believe it if you wish? 2. Have you any desire for religion? 3. Have you at any time believed in religion? If so, and you have relinquished that belief, state your reasons for this course. 4. If you believe in no religion, what do you depend on for regulating your daily conduct? Do you dislike religion? If so, why? 5. If you do not believe in religion yourself, do you recognize its necessity for others? If so, on what ground?

Answers to such questions from university students might be supposed to indicate the maturer mind, yet conclusions of a satisfactory kind cannot be drawn from the replies, though they are thought-provoking. Such answers are, as a matter of fact, not complete enough to give assurance of a trend, and inferences may be made from them which would be very erroneous. In this instance over one third of those who replied concerning the religious influences to which they had been subjected in their homes acknowledged that friends and relations had made religious impressions upon them, though these were often of a very general character. Very few recognized any religious influence upon them made by the schools. Most of those admitting this had been in mission schools. The home religious influence of those from Buddhist families had been the highest; that of strictly Confucian homes the lowest, though possibly they were discriminating mentally between Confucianism as an ethical and a religious system. Some acknowledged that they had been prejudiced against religion by parents or guardians, but this most frequently meant against Christianity in particular. The anti-religious impressions received in the schools was attested to by about one in five of those who answered the inquiry. The confession that it is the superstitious element of religions which is most obnoxious is significant, as is also that of the prejudice received by the failure in the lives

of religious persons, and specially priests. Many of the students declared their prejudice against Christianity because they had been taught that it was injurious to the state. Nearly two fifths of the university students testified to having been religiously impressed by literature. Many expressions of belief were made that religion of some sort has been at the base of the convictions of the men who have accomplished great things in numerous instances. Others attributed their want of faith in religion to the reading of works of science; and still others to the reading of history, which showed them that many evils and wrongs were attributable to the religions of various lands and ages.

But the specially noteworthy answer was that two thirds of the whole believed in no religion whatever. The reason assigned by the major part of these for nonacceptance of, or nonbelief in, any religion was the hindrances or obstacles to their doing so. These were objections on the part of relations, intellectual doubts awakened by scientific research, or lack of time to maturely consider the subject. About one eighth of them acknowledged that they had no desire for religion of any kind; they objected to the thing itself. Of those acknowledging the necessity of recognizing some sort of ethical restraint, more than one half preferred to follow their own conscience rather than accept the ethical standards formulated by any of the religious systems. The trend of the answers as to the benefit of religion to society showed that those who replied considered religion rather a device than of value for its own merit.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

A WHOLLY new phase of the question of wealth is gradually pressing on the conscience of Christendom. The marked and marvelous combinations which increase the opportunity for the evangelization of the world, and also the slowly awaking sense of obligation among Christians to their corresponding duty, are now face to face with hitherto unimagined financial possibilities. The missionary openings demand money in what some would count fabulous sums. Thousands of men and women are ready to do or die, if they may push the kingdom of Christ to the ends of the earth. Nothing seems lacking to complete the coordination but an intelligent mastery of the new problem of the distribution of wealth. Dr. L. G. Powers, chief statistician of the government census, reports the wealth of this country alone at ninety thousand million dollars, the addition in the last decade being twenty-five thousand million—a saving within a decade equal to the aggregate savings of our people from the discovery of America to the civil war, and exceeding the savings of the world from the beginnings of history to the Declaration of American Independence in 1776. The new problem is to discover the law of distribution of surplus wealth. The grace of God is necessary to its solution, and the work of evangelizing the world must come into the count.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

Paul Feine. The Gospel as St. Paul understood and taught it continues to be a subject of investigation, particularly the question as to the course of the great apostle's own religious development, from which, in a considerable degree, it is supposed his doctrines sprang. Feine has given much study to this subject, the results of which he has embodied in a recent book, entitled *Das gesetzesfreie Evangelium des Paulus* (Paul's Doctrine of Gospel Freedom from the Law). Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1899. One of the first and most important questions Feine tries to answer is that concerning the religious consciousness of Paul prior to his conversion to Christianity. He reaches the conclusion that up to the time of his conversion Paul was through and through a Pharisee, in no wise influenced by Hellenism so far as his religious views were concerned. This he regards as well established by his reference to the Pharisaic conception of the Messiah found in 2 Cor. v, 16. But, as to the law, Feine thinks it certain that Paul was strictly a Pharisee prior to his conversion, and that he had looked with entire satisfaction, and even with pride, upon his zeal for the law and his righteousness under it, as Phil. iii, 6, seems to show. But by his conversion he came to see both the Messiah and the law from an entirely new standpoint, namely, that of Hellenic-Judaistic forms of thought, and reached the conclusion that his former views belonged to his period of unenlightenment. By the vision on the Damascus road the Messiah came to appear to him as not only risen and ascended, but also as spiritual, and no longer to be known or thought of in the flesh. It was also as a Christian that he came to think of the flesh as the seat of sin, and the law as the power by which sin was awakened and strengthened within man. His conversion carried with it the thought of Christianity as the universal religion. There is no evidence of a development in his Christian conception of the significance of the law. Gal. i, 10, and v, 11, do not imply that Paul had at one time in his Christian life entertained a more favorable view of circumcision. On the other hand, he felt, even before his conversion, that the standpoint of the primitive apostles was untenable. When he comes to the varied utterances of Paul with regard to the law Feine admits that the apostle's conceptions are not altogether harmonious. Paul estimates himself differently, according as he thinks of himself as fleshly or as dead to sin and the flesh through the spirit of Christ. Sometimes he thinks of the law, especially in its sublimated and spiritual aspects, as the standard, even for Christians. At other times he thinks of the Christian as in possession of the Spirit, and therewith of a standard which needs no complement in the law. A peculiarity of Feine's theory is that, since he makes conversion introduce

the sense of sin by means of a new conception of the law, he is compelled to view such a passage as Rom. vii, 14 ff., as belonging to Paul's Christian experience, and as a fair representation of what all Christians are likely to experience. This is, indeed, a conclusion which some modern exegetes are coming to, who proceed on a different theory from that of Feine. Whether Paul meant it to refer to his experience at any time subsequent to his conversion or not, it is certain that it describes phases of the experience of many other Christians.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Die Bildung des Clerus in Kirchlichen Seminarien oder an Staatsuniversitäten. Historische Skizze eines hundertjährigen Kampfes in Deutschland (The Education of the Clergy in Seminaries of the Church Compared with their Education in State Universities. An Historical Sketch of a Century's Conflict in Germany). By J. B. Holzammer. Mayence, F. Kirchheim, 1900. The union of State and Church opens some problems in the education of the clergy which are practically unknown to us in America, where the State could not possibly undertake theological instruction. We take it for granted that our ministry must be educated at the expense of the Church. The most that can be done in our country is to attempt to make theological education undenominational, as at Harvard, though the agency of the State is universally excluded. In countries where Church and State are united it is to be expected that the State shall provide for theological, as for all other, education. To this only those Protestants need seriously object who feel that the State is out of sympathy with their particular sect or denomination. But Roman Catholics, by virtue of their theory that their Church is the only custodian of true doctrine, might, and many of them do, object to State education of the clergy. On the other hand, many Roman Catholics think that such education is not only an advantage to the Church, but really a necessity. Of course, these are of the class that recognize the danger to the Church arising from great restriction of thought. They realize that profound conviction can be produced only in those who have fought out the conflict of antagonistic faith and have reached a satisfying conclusion. This book of Holzammer's takes the other view. To its author the existence of the Church is dependent upon the right education of the clergy, and this can be secured only in Church seminaries. Among the greatest dangers to the Church from State university education of the clergy is the fact that the professors are officials of the State and hence cannot be deposed by the bishops, who are the proper representatives of the doctrinal authority of the Church. Another danger arises from the fact that at the universities the Roman Catholic students come into contact with students and professors of other communions, by whom of necessity they are more or less influenced. Strange as this seems to a Protestant, it is

the only logical standpoint for a Roman Catholic, who is supposed to believe that his Church is incapable of going astray or of missing any truth of God. A third danger arises from the temptations to vice which are inseparable from the ordinary university life in Germany. In contrast with all this our author points out that when the professors are practically chosen by the bishops the doctrines taught must be correct. For Methodists, at least, this is a strange doctrine; as though bishops were more likely to be orthodox and to have the truth than others. Such a view can be held only by those who believe in the Roman Catholic doctrine of the bishop as the depository of an unbroken tradition. We trust the small freedom enjoyed by Romanist professors of theology in German universities will not be taken from them.

Johann Tetzel, der Ablassprediger (John Tetzel, the Preacher of Indulgences). By Nikolaus Paulus. Mayence, F. Kirchheim, 1899. The intimate connection of Tetzel with the abuses which led Luther to begin his reformatory work will always give the notorious preacher of indulgences a position of great interest in the minds of all students of the Church history of the sixteenth century. It has become more and more a purpose on the part of Roman Catholic historians to rescue the name of Tetzel from the odium which attaches to it. This book by Paulus is written for that purpose. In order to this Paulus undertakes to show that Tetzel was neither as immoral nor as ignorant as he has generally had the reputation of being. But not even Roman Catholic skill in explaining away unfavorable testimony will suffice here, for the bad reputation of Tetzel does not rest on the assertion of Luther made in 1541, but on the letter of the papal nuncio, Karl von Miltitz, the brief of Pope Leo X to Luther, and the word of a loyal son of the Church, Johann Hass, Burgomaster of Gorlitz—all of which testimonies are unshaken and have the advantage of being contemporary with the exciting period when Tetzel was being most strongly condemned by Luther. But, in addition to this vain attempt to whiten the Ethiopian's skin, Paulus considers the teachings of Tetzel relative to indulgences. He tries to make it appear that that teaching can be discovered from three sources: (1) The so-called Frankfort theses, which, having been written by Wimpina and not by Tetzel, are no evidence as to Tetzel's doctrine; (2) the somewhat detailed official instructions according to which Tetzel ought to have proceeded in the sale of indulgences; and (3) certain sermons which possibly Tetzel left behind him. We think it very evident that none of these, nor all of them together, can be safely depended upon to reveal what Tetzel actually did. At most they exhibit the theory in its best form; and they cannot disprove the accusations which were made against him by both the friends and the foes of the Reformation. And Paulus himself confesses that, at least in substance, Tetzel taught that as soon as the indul-

gence fee rattled on the bottom of the money box the soul for which the indulgence was purchased sprang out of purgatory. Strangely enough, while Paulus tries to make that teaching unsound, from his own elaboration of the current instructions to sellers of indulgences it appears clear that Tetzel was well within his instructions when he so taught. For, according to Paulus, the instructions declared that if anyone wish to turn an indulgence to the account of one deceased, he need only perform the required external work, such as the payment of the money; it was not necessary that he himself be in a state of grace; and, further, as soon as the preceding conditions were fulfilled the indulgence became at once efficacious in all its extent, for the soul for whose benefit it was purchased. Paulus, so far from clearing Tetzel in this respect, has involved the Church in Tetzel's disgrace.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

The Baptists in Germany. Since the founding of the first Baptist congregation in Hamburg, in 1834, the growth has been so encouraging that in 1899 there were 8 associations, numbering 155 congregations, with 28,898 members. Including children and other unbaptized persons more or less closely related to the Church, they have a constituency of about 70,000 souls. They have property to the amount of 3,700,000 marks. There are 217 preachers and elders and 47 evangelists and colporteurs, and the number baptized in 1899 was 1,763. The number excluded from the Church by disciplinary action was 624, which shows either that the discipline is exceedingly strict or that a very fickle class of the communities is reached. The net gain in membership during the year (1899) was 558, which is much below the average for the last ten years. The Sunday school work is effective. The number of Sunday schools is 417, with a total attendance of 18,237 members of classes. They have a missionary society, organized in 1891, with 9 self-supporting congregations and 53 mission stations, and 447 converts during 1899. The whole sum received for all purposes was 607,425 marks, or an average per member of something over twenty-one marks. They have a seminary in Hamburg for the training of preachers. The course of study extends through four years, and there are thirty-one students in attendance. From Germany the Baptists have spread into Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Russia, Roumania, and Australia.

The Sorrows of the French Secular Clergy. Many causes are mentioned as leading to the exodus of Roman Catholic priests from the Church in France. Among them a chief one is the position taken by the pope on all matters pertaining to modern progress. But those who are in a position to know the facts affirm that the one great cause is the deplorable condition of the priests. Prior to the Revolution there were 36,000 of the clergy whose positions were independent of episcopal appointment. Since the concordet of 1801 there

are but 3,425 of these, while 34,000 priests are subject to the caprices of the bishop for their positions. The support also is very meager, being 900 francs for those under, and 1,000 francs for those over, sixty years of age, until at seventy the priest receives 1,300 francs. The perquisites are seldom very valuable, and there is no provision for those priests who are disabled. But the principal source of the sorrows of the secular clergy is the growth in power of the religious orders, whose members are preferred as teachers, confessors, preachers, and pastors by high and low. In consequence, the secular clergy have become constantly poorer, and the orders richer. Their numbers increase with their wealth. In 1789 there were 60,000 members of the orders, male and female; in 1899 there were 160,000. Besides all this, in any conflict of interests between the orders and the secular clergy the authorities at Rome favor the former, even though all fully understand that the latter have right and justice on their side. Nothing but the profoundest conviction or the greatest indifference can hold the secular clergy of France in the Roman Catholic Church under these circumstances.

Shall Donations be Forbidden? Nothing less than this has been done in many parts of Germany, and in other parts the tendency is in that direction. The argument is that the clergy are brought into disrepute and contempt by these gifts. Everyone knows that, while they are often bestowed as tokens of the affection of the congregation, they are nevertheless intended to serve a less sentimental purpose, namely, to supplement the salary which is thereby confessed to be too small. Thus the pastor is made dependent upon the good will of the people for an honest and sufficient support. The effect is undoubtedly to belittle the pastorate into an institution that does not earn what is given and to reduce the pastor to an object of charity. On the other hand, say those who believe that donations should at least not be forbidden by law, these gifts afford an opportunity for the congregation to express its appreciation of a pastor whose services make him especially worthy. They claim that the association between pastor and people is not one of a strictly business nature, and that this tender and intimate relationship which the pastorate demands for its highest usefulness ought not to be interfered with by forbidding expressions of affection of a substantial kind on the part of the congregation. Still others argue that, if donations cease, taxes for the support of the ministry must increase. Probably all thoughtful pastors and laymen in our country have reflected on the evils and advantages of donations. The peculiarity in Germany is that the agitation is greater than the case warrants, and that the conservatives charge the liberals with being back of the abolition movement, thus making it a party question. As a matter of fact conservatives also believe in the abolition of donations.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

With all of its excellencies the form of government peculiar to the United States is not ideal. This conviction, into which the student of the times must inevitably come, is that strongly held by Professor Woodrow Wilson in his discussion of "Democracy and Efficiency," as found in the *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston) for March. "We have not escaped," he declares, "the laws of error that government is heir to. It is said that riots and disorders are more frequent amongst us than in any other country of the same degree of civilization; justice is not always done in our courts; our institutions do not prevent, they do not seem even to moderate, contests between capital and labor; our laws of property are no more equitable, our laws of marriage no more moralizing, than those of undemocratic nations, our contemporaries; our cities are perhaps worse governed than any in Europe outside the Turkish empire and Spain; crime defies or evades the law amongst us as amongst other peoples less favored in matters of freedom and privilege; we have no monopoly either of happiness or of enlightened social order. As we grow older, we grow also perplexed and awkward in the doing of justice and in the perfecting and safeguarding of liberty. . . . We have supposed that there could be one way of efficiency for democratic governments and another for monarchical. We have declined to provide ourselves with a professional civil service, because we deemed it undemocratic; we have made shift to do without a trained diplomatic and consular service because we thought the training given by other governments to their foreign agents unnecessary in the case of affairs so simple and unsophisticated as the foreign relations of a democracy in politics and trade; . . . we have hesitated to put our presidents or governors or mayors into direct and responsible relations of leadership with our legislatures and councils in the making of laws and ordinances, because such a connection between lawmakers and executive officers seemed inconsistent with the theory of checks and balances whose realization in practice we understood Montesquieu to have proved essential to the maintenance of a free government. Our theory, in short, has paid as little heed to efficiency as our practice. It has been a theory of nonprofessionalism in public affairs; and in many great matters of public action nonprofessionalism is nonefficiency." A new era has however suddenly dawned, bringing a "frontage toward the Orient," but not before we are ready. "No other modern nation has been schooled as we have been in big undertakings and the mastery of novel difficulties. We have become confirmed in energy, in resourcefulness, in practical proficiency, in self-confidence. We have become confirmed, also, so far as our character is concerned, in the habit of acting under an odd mixture of selfish and altruistic motives. . . . It is only just now,

however, that we have awakened to our real relationship to the rest of mankind. Absorbed in our own development, we had fallen into a singular ignorance of the rest of the world. The isolation in which we lived was quite without parallel in modern history." Through this we have come into an attitude of false self-confidence and self-sufficiency, as instanced in our views on the money question and on self-government itself. The new tasks we have undertaken will, however, transform us. They were destined inevitably to come, and are strangely opportune. "The East is to be opened and transformed, whether we will or no; the standards of the West are to be imposed upon it; nations and peoples which have stood still the centuries through are to be quickened and made part of the universal world of commerce and of ideas which has so steadily been a-making by the advance of European power from age to age. It is our peculiar duty, as it is also England's, to moderate the process in the interests of liberty; to impart to the peoples thus driven out upon the road of change, so far as we have opportunity or can make it, our own principles of self-help; teach them order and self-control in the midst of change; . . . secure for them, when we may, the free intercourse and the natural development which shall make them at least equal members of the family of nations." What we shall do promises also to affect ourselves. "The reactions which such experiments in the universal validity of principle and method are likely to bring about in respect of our own domestic institutions cannot be calculated or forecast. Old principles applied in a new field may show old applications to have been clumsy and ill considered. We may ourselves get responsible leadership instead of government by mass meeting; a trained and thoroughly organized administrative service, instead of administration by men privately nominated and blindly elected; a new notion of terms of office and of standards of policy. If we but keep our ideals clear, our principles steadfast, we need not fear the change." In other words, change does not mean dismemberment. "The world is at last ready to accept the moral long ago drawn for it by de Tocqueville," who "predicted the stability of the government of the United States, not because of its intrinsic excellence, but because of its suitability to the particular social, economic, and political conditions of the people and the country for whose use and administration it had been framed."

THE article upon "The Educational Value of the Bible," by E. W. Work, D.D., in the April number of the *Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ* (Dayton, O.), is attractive in its presentation of important truth. Macaulay is instanced as recording his indebtedness to the Scripture; the testimony of Ruskin upon the same point is referred to; the statement is made that in the two volumes of Lowell's letters recently published are found references taken from twenty-five books in the Bible; and even Byron's mastery of style is attributed to his familiarity with the

English Bible. "The strong and simple Saxon of the King James Version is in part the secret of its charm. Experiments at improving the style of the Bible have been uniformly disastrous. In the year 1833 a clergyman in New England published a translation of the New Testament intended especially for the literary and cultured classes. 'Why,' said he, 'should the Christian Scriptures be divested even of decent ornament?' The following are some of his translations: 'When thou art beneficent, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand performs;' 'Contemplate the lilies of the field, how they advance;' 'At that time Jesus took occasion to say, "I entirely concur with thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth;"' 'Every plantation which my heavenly Father has not cultivated shall be extirpated;' 'Salt is salutary; but if the salt has become vapid, how can it be restored?' 'Be not surprised that I announced to thee, "Ye must be reproduced;"' 'For this the Father loves me, because I gave up my life to be afterwards resumed. No one divests me of it, but I personally resign it. I have authority to resign it, and I have authority to resume it;' 'There are numerous apartments in my Father's temple; if not, I would have informed you.' These illustrations will make it clear that to try to improve the style of the Bible is the same as trying to paint the lily or to beautify the sky." Of the educational value of the Scripture the author further says: "Some books touch us on the intellectual side, others on the emotional side, others still on the side of will or determination. The Bible touches us on all sides. No faculty of the mind is left out in the appeal which it makes. To-day it enters one door of the mind, and to-morrow another—or enters one door with one person, and another door with another person. This is what is meant by the variety of the Scripture, not mere variety in form, but intellectual variety such as relates itself most intimately to the mind and its changing moods, to life and its variant circumstances." And of the power of the Scripture to awaken religious life the author finally says: "From astonishing sources has come testimony to this power of the Bible to awaken a spiritual life. Men have tried preaching sermons from other books, but they were like 'painted ships on painted oceans.' It was poor Heine's testimony, man of rich intellect and wayward will: 'The reawakening of my religious feelings I owe to that holy book, the Bible. Astonishing! that after I have whirled about all my life over all the dance-floors of philosophy, and yielded myself to all the orgies of the intellect, and paid my addresses to all possible systems without satisfaction, like Messalina, after a licentious night, I now find myself on the same standpoint where poor Uncle Tom stands, on that of the Bible.'"

An instance of permissible hero-worship is found in "A Tribute to Verdi," as written by Pietro Mascagni, of Rome, and published in the *International Monthly* (Burlington, Vt.) for April. Of the period in

which the great composer wrote—who now leaves to the world "an inextinguishable patrimony of art"—the author says: "One might well say that destiny wished with the glorious existence of the *maestro* to perpetuate, in the midst of man, the glory of music, the grandiose epoch of melodrama, the famous historical period of our operatic theater, which gave to the nineteenth century the title of 'Century of Melody.' To that magnificent period Giuseppe Verdi belonged, together with Gioachino Rossini, Gaetano Donizetti, Vincenzo Bellini, to name only the greatest. History will record that that period was initiated eighty-five years ago with the 'Barber of Seville,' and was closed at the end of the last century with 'Falstaff;' and it will record, also, that Rossini was born in the eighteenth century and that Verdi died in the twentieth. O, the power of such genius which has for an entire century educated the hearts and minds of many generations! To-day all would seem finished, after the passing of the last of these great ones, if one did not think that there still remain their work and memory." Of the industry of Verdi, which extended into extreme old age, and of his final devotion to religion, the author also adds: "Young men arose, and he followed them anxiously, full of hope in their first steps. Alas! his great dream was not to be realized. The young ones had taken the wrong way. He saw that the whole of his work had become almost barren; he saw the real danger for the national theater, so thought he would warn those who had lost their way, that he would call them back to the straight road, that he would save them and with them the future of Italian music. He knew he was old by the years he could count, but he felt still strong and vigorous, and that he could not overcome the fever for work. It was still his holy mission; so, at the age of eighty years, Verdi offered with 'Falstaff' the most marvelous example of intellectual power, and gave to the melodramatic theater the newest, the boldest direction. . . . He gave another and the very last proof of his feeling for the Italian school at the age of eighty-six with fire and exceptional faith, but it was not for the theater that he wrote. . . . When he arrived at the most momentous years of his existence he turned his thoughts once more toward religion, but he would not use in any way the new precepts, the dogmas, and reforms which to-day regulate church music. Impatient, as always, of every formula, he produced his last composition, calmly writing his 'Pezzi Sacri' (Sacred Pieces) with that same expression of sentiment so natural to him, and which, in its devotion and piety, assumes a very special character. Verdi, who will remain in the history of music as the strongest, the most sincere, and the most capable interpreter of human and dramatic sentiment, wished to leave men and earth with his soul full of prayer and piety. It was the last and the holiest sign of his mission as musician and as man, it was the last warning, it was the last inheritance which goes to swell the immense patrimony of art and of feeling, which the great master leaves to the Fatherland, and which will bring forth fruit gloriously."

BOOK NOTICES.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

The New Epoch for Faith. By GEORGE A. GORDON, D.D., Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. 12mo, pp. 412. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, $1.50.

Any reader of Dr. Gordon's *The Christ of To-day*, and of *The Witness to Immortality in Literature, Philosophy, and Life*, is likely to take up this book with keen expectancy, and will probably finish it with the feeling that the author's latest is his greatest. However he may hesitate over some things in it, and disagree point-blank with others, he will not find it easy to break the unified reasoning of the book, and he may concede the propriety of applying to this volume Dr. Gordon's own words concerning Principal Caird's Gifford Lectures, *Fundamental Ideas of Christianity*, "Under new phrases and modes of treatment lie in fresh clearness wide expanses of important truth." The conviction which framed the title of this book is that, to-day, Christian faith has a new and larger chance for its essentials, the century's doubt having proved ultimately the justifier and confirmer of faith; and in the closing chapter on "Things Expected" the author indicates some of the great issues for which he confidently hopes. Whether we regard the movements of our times as he regards them or not, we cannot well deny that his tall watch-tower has a very wide outlook over the field. Freely confessing that the situation is greater than his vision, and its meaning vaster than his judgment, he as freely speaks his "honest and emphatic opinion concerning crises upon which he has looked through his own eyes and through all other available eyes." The author's hope, to follow this with a sequel volume on the conceptions of faith that come out of the nineteenth century, seems somewhat shadowed by what, we trust, is only a temporary failure of health, necessitating vacation from pastoral duties. This book *assumes* that the religious view of the universe is true, that God is present in human life and that he works for ends, that human progress is real and that man's world possesses imperishable worth. "Of man's universe the Incarnation is the center, and God in history, in society, in the redeemed but progressive life of mankind is the permanent aspect of the Infinite love." The second chapter is on "The Advent of Humanity," and begins by saying that the best word for the distinctive character of the nineteenth century is humanity; it has been marked by a surpassing advent of humanity. It is noted that the two greatest ideas of the modern world, the idea of a universe and the idea of a humanity, both had a religious origin. Long before Newton discovered the union of all material things under the omnipresent force of gravity; ages before modern physics had gathered the worlds of space into one infinite kingdom, religious insight had dated all things from

the divine will, and grounded all things in it. The idea of a universe came as the inevitable consequence of the idea of God. Through large inductions and wide generalizations modern science has vindicated this idea of unity; it has given unexpected richness and range to the religious intuition; yet it was religion, and not scientific investigation, that first gave to the race this great conception. And for the origin of the idea of humanity one must go to the same high source. The other civilizing forces of the world look to religion for the discovery that God "made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The Christian apostle was justified by the historical fact when he connected the idea of a human race with the conception of men as sons of God. The Hebrew faith that men are made in the likeness of God is the ultimate source of the idea of humanity. Monotheism is the priceless gift of the Old Testament to the modern world. Of this tree of life the two great branches are that *all worlds* and *all men* are *one* in *the one perfect God.* Following this statement, the author points out some of the forces which have obstructed the recognition of the brotherhood of man, and some of the periods in which the idea of the unity of the race gained strength, and among modern witnesses to the advent of humanity names the French Revolution, the poetry of Robert Burns and the influence of literature, socialism, the transformation of science, the missionary interest, and the influence of the United States. A stimulating and provocative study is the third chapter on "The New Appreciation of Christianity," setting forth Christianity as the religion of man and of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. It closes by presenting Paul, the great Christian optimist of the first century, as the proper type and example for to-day. Paul comprehended the contradiction which the Roman empire presented in thought, in character, and in custom to the law of love in the kingdom of God; yet to the apostle the world was a world to be redeemed. He knew that the points of antipathy to his message were fundamental; yet he felt the forces in the imperial environment which were sympathetic to his gospel to be even more important, and he availed himself of those forces with tact and power. As at Athens, so everywhere, he began with the devoutness and the faith already in existence, and the altar to the Unknown God was the shrine upon which he unveiled the God and Father of Christ. Heathenism had a vast range of sympathy toward the new teacher, and the conquest that marks the career of this great man is due to the fact that by the power of the Spirit he laid a master's hand upon the side of the world sympathetic toward his purpose. The world of to-day also presents contradictions to the Christian ideal; and the unconquerable optimist, seeking the redemption of the world, will approach it on the side where it shows rudimentary or incipient sympathies toward the Christian purpose and message. The chapters following are on "The Discipline of Doubt" (showing the services of doubt to faith), "The Return of Faith" (showing that it is a return to the God and Father of Christ, is

due to a resurgence of conscious religious need, and is helped by the dominance of an idealistic philosophy), and "The New Help from History." This is not a text-book for the class room; here and there it parts company with some things still credible and valid; it is a scout's reconnoissance of regions wet with the fresh morning dew of the twentieth century. Some pages must be quoted. "The life of Jesus Christ is part of human history, it is part of the universe. And if one is seeking to discover the ultimate character of the universe, it can be little short of fatal to neglect its supreme manifestation. The idea of the Incarnation lives in the strength of the axiom of cause and effect. The cause must equal the product; Jesus Christ is not self-originated. In the highest metaphysics of theology he is still the begotten of the Father. His advent, his ministry, his passion, his whole character and career in this world need explanation. The principle of causation cries out for satisfaction here as elsewhere. Christ is a gift, a product, an effect, a manifestation of the universe; and to generalize upon the character of the universe in neglect of this supreme fact is, in the last degree, unphilosophical. In a lower sense this contention holds true also of the whole brotherhood of the brave, the good, the wise. They could not have been what they were without the endowment, the spirit, the opportunity, and the constant inspiration which they received at the hands of the universe. In the last analysis, therefore, they are witnesses for the universe. The motto written upon the forehead of every wise and just man is in the words: 'By the grace of God I am what I am.' . . . Man is the real witness for God; man at his best is the supreme evidence of the Spirit of God. The Incarnation is the only fair and adequate form in which to put the case of faith in behalf of the character of the universe before the jury of human intelligence." Again, in the same chapter: "Carlyle and Tennyson are better representatives of the spiritual meaning of the nineteenth century than Matthew Arnold and James Thomson, precisely because in the two first named the preparation for the new vision of spiritual reality is larger and more evident. Carlyle and Tennyson were both great doubters, but in both the negative movement was emphatically in the interest of discovery. Arnold surrendered more and more to doubt; while Carlyle and Tennyson, in their unceasing fight against unreality, became witnesses to substantial, benignant, abiding truth. Both have their deepest significance in their discontent with the world's vision of God, and in their strangely contrasted but common call to look more piercingly into the heart of things. Tennyson writes, 'My chief desire is to have a new vision of God.' Carlyle writes, 'The universe is full of love, and also of inexorable sternness and veracity; and it remains forever true that God reigns!'" In the chapter on "The Return of Faith" is this: "For about twenty years evolution was the romance of the intellectual world. The world was drunk with it, the season of inebriety was long, and the condition unusually heavy. Darwin, Wallace, Spencer, Lewes, Haeckel, Huxley, Tyndall, Fiske,

and scores of others were the names that monopolized attention. Evolution as an intellectual interest was universal and sovereign, and mainly, though not exclusively, in its materialistic form. Evolution was the fad of the intellectual world, and that means that it must surely pass. The mental organism of mankind could not endure this spell forever. The mood was too intense and one-sided to last. It spent its force twenty years ago; it no longer lives except in a transformed existence, and as a minister to interests mightier than itself. It has given place to the science that has at least the will to believe, and especially in Great Britain and America, to the idealistic movement in philosophy. A generation ago the majority, perhaps, of those of the medical profession who had obtained a European education were agnostics; the exact opposite of this may be said to be the case to-day. Materialistic science thirty years ago controlled the larger body of scientific students; to-day science is delightfully surprised by the fact of religion. The materialistic mood has exhausted itself." Again: "All theories of the universe are on probation; none of them is demonstrably true. This is the situation that gives faith its opportunity. Ultimate beliefs appeal for supporters by the evidence in favor of them, by their inherent reasonableness, and in one case by the additional claim of absolute nobility. Christian theism blends in its appeal these three voices. It is able to produce evidences of its truth that rise to high probability; it may confidently assert the inherent reasonableness of its interpretation of the universe; and in its highest form it adds the further attraction of utter nobility. The union of these three claims—evidence, reasonableness, worthiness—constitute the unique power of Christian theism over the mind of civilized man." Professor James's book, *The Will to Believe*, is recalled by what our author says concerning the option of faith: "Faith selects from the possibilities of the case the idea that is highest, that has the most and best to say for itself, and that is worthiest of support, as well as most supporting, during hours of darkness. Faith is essentially choice, at least it involves this function. It is a selection from among competing notions of the one that is likeliest to be true, and which, in the absence of complete proof, is best deserving of human devotion. And upon this ground there cannot be the least doubt as to the choice which an unfettered faith will make. The basis of the universe is either mental or nonmental, atheistic or theistic. . . . That cannot be true which if heeded would make impossible the noblest tradition of mankind. That cannot be true which if acknowledged would reduce to an idle dream the best in the thought and character of the race. Let the moral will defend itself and brand the materialism which would reduce it to folly as the superlative impostor. Between a universe grounded in mud and a universe based upon mind the choice and devotion of faith go to the latter. Thus faith makes its first disjunctive judgment. It must be either atheism or theism; it cannot be atheism, therefore it is theism." A unique feature of this book is the power it attributes to humor as a

discipline of saving common sense, a rectifier of errors, and a servant of truth. One chapter uses the story, given by Canon Liddon, of a Presbyterian minister who, in behalf of Queen Victoria, and in her presence, prayed thus: "Grant that as she grows to be an old woman she may be made a new man; and that in all righteous causes she may go forth before her people like a he-goat on the mountains." It is a mixture of reverent intention with ludicrous impropriety.

Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament. Eight Lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, Yale University. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, United Free Church of Scotland, Glasgow College. 12mo, pp. 325. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, $1.50.

The air is full of biblical criticism, theological journals must discuss it and popular journals are perfectly willing to follow them. The preachers of all Churches have accepted a good deal of it, or are rather nervous about it and afraid to have anything to do with it. It is sad, but it is true, that not a few preachers have heard and read so much about Old Testament criticism that they are afraid to use the old books in the same way as before, lest some well-read hearer deem them ignorant of the new thought. They are afraid to preach about Moses, for they are not sure that criticism has really left the great fame of the mighty lawgiver altogether intact, and uneasily turn away to seek fields less marked by recent controversy. They have heard this bit of history doubted and that piece set in some new light, and their faith is really disturbed, unnecessarily disturbed indeed, but none the less really. What are such men to do? Practical affairs press too strongly upon them to permit their undertaking the elaborate study necessary to understand the problems and attain independence of judgment upon them. They must take criticism at second hand, and they need a guide. If a guide could be secured who was at once a critic and a preacher the ideal would surely be attained. Professor George Adam Smith, of Glasgow, is one of the foremost of modern biblical scholars. He has made original contributions to criticism, everywhere recognized as important; his book on the Geography of the Holy Land is the best on its subject, and he is withal a preacher of power and unction, swaying men with a powerful presentation of the Gospel of Christ. As a critic he knows what criticism is and how many of its results have found general acceptance. As a preacher he knows how far he has been personally able to use the results and how far they have modified his own message to men. In every respect he is qualified to introduce to preachers the modern historical and literary criticism, and to instruct them concerning its possible bearing upon their own message to men. The book contains eight lectures, with the following titles: The Liberty and Duty of Old Testament Criticism as Proved from the New Testament; The Course and Character of Modern Criticism; The Historical Basis in the Old Testament; The Proof of a Divine Revelation in the Old Testament;

The Spirit of Christ in the Old Testament; The Hope of Immortality in the Old Testament; The Preaching of Prophets to Their Own Times, with Some Account of Their Influence upon the Social Ethics of Christendom; The Christian Preacher and the Books of Wisdom. The first quality that the careful reader will perceive in this book is its tone of confident, optimistic conservatism in respect of the fundamentals of the Christian view of the Scriptures. Here, for example, is a representative paragraph: "I think it can be shown that criticism, so far from throwing doubts either upon the uniqueness of Israel's true knowledge of God, or upon the personal influence of God as producing this, certainly proves the former, and leaves us with the latter as its most natural and scientific explanation. Or to put this otherwise—the most advanced modern criticism provides grounds for the proof of a Divine Revelation in the Old Testament at least more firm than those on which the older apologetic used to rely." To this paragraph there is appended a footnote so important that we cannot forbear its quotation though it is long: "It would be very easy to prove the compatibility of belief in Revelation in the Old Testament with the results of modern criticism by simply citing the personal dicta of some of the most eminent critics. There is an idea abroad among Christians that the whole critical school are hostile to belief in Revelation. For this some critics, who avoid the question of Revelation even when their discoveries lead them to the verge of it, are partly to blame; but it would be readily dispelled by the explicit confessions of such belief by other critics, and these among the most able and advanced. Kuenen, in his collected Essays, approaches the question of Revelation in the Old Testament, yet never addresses himself to it. I stated this in a review of the German translation of the Essays (Kuenen's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1894) in the *Expositor* (July–December, 1895), and the translator, Professor Budde, a pupil of Kuenen, and one of the most eminent of German critics, wrote me that the observation was right, but that as for himself his belief in 'a genuine revelation of God in the Old Testament remains rock-fast.' That belief has been shared and stated by a number of advanced critics. The late Professor Robertson Smith affirmed again and again his belief in the Divine Origin of the Old Testament, and in the last of his Burnett Lectures (unfortunately unpublished) proved 'the uniqueness of Hebrew prophecy and the impossibility of accounting for it by natural or historical reasons' (from a manuscript report of the last Burnett Lecture). Compare also *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 297." Expressions of similar assurance abound in the book. To some who are wavering and hesitant, fearful and disquieted amid modern critical struggles, the book will be a veritable tonic. But the careful reader will probably observe a second thing in the book. He will notice by the side of this optimism a perfect frankness in the statement of these new views. They are new, they are more or less in conflict with venerable traditions, they do involve a reconstruction in the inherited faith of most men, and Pre-

fessor Smith makes these facts perfectly plain. Let no man hastily accept them under the impression that it makes no particular difference one way or the other. It does make much difference, and each reader will do well to mark this carefully. Here is the modern critical view, and here is the manner in which a distinguished preacher uses it in the practical work of the ministry. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind, but let him not neglect to read this book if he desire an easy and attractive avenue into the field of criticism, or if he be already disturbed by questions to which his mind finds no ready answer.

Sunday, the True Sabbath of God; or, Saturday Proven to be Neither the Sabbath of the Old Testament nor the Sabbath of the Ancients who Lived before the Christian Era. Being a Complete Refutation of the Saturday-Sabbath Heresy and a Vindication of the Changeableness of the Day of the Sabbath. By SAMUEL WALTER GAMBLE, of Ottawa, Kansas, a Member of the South Kansas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and a Field Secretary of the American Sabbath Union of New York City, etc. 12mo, pp. 203. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. New York: Eaton & Mains. Price, cloth, $1.

In counteracting the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventists throughout the West the author of this volume has given conspicuous and useful service. Upon these Adventists he puts the responsibility of the defeat of the Blair "Sunday-Rest Bill," while their present efforts are directed toward "the repeal of all Sabbath laws, both in State and nation," these efforts being fortified by the voluminous outputs of two large publishing houses. The influence of these Adventists, according to Mr. Gamble, is most pernicious. Not only have they undermined the popular conviction upon the sanctity of the Sabbath, but they have also in the past seven years succeeded in doubling the amount of compulsory Sabbath labor, so that it is now "estimated that over four million American laboring men are compelled to labor every day alike, or risk being thrown out of employment if they refuse to labor on the Sabbath." Such is the evil influence which Mr. Gamble, in the intervals of a busy secretaryship, has aimed to antagonize by the writing of the present treatise. His position, in a word, is that the Sabbath has existed from the beginning, the day given to Adam in Eden having been Sunday and not Saturday, and that this Sabbath, having been kept for about eighteen centuries, was lost; that "after the confusion of tongues a great variety of Sabbath countings was instituted, which changed the Sabbath from twelve to thirty-six times a year from one day of the week to another;" that "God led the Egyptians into the nearest approach to the Edenic Sabbath, by enabling them to establish a fixed week of seven days, commencing with the day of Saturn and ending with a seventh-day Sabbath—Friday;" that God "gave the children of Israel a system of fixed-date Sabbaths, which changed once every year between the Exodus and the Crucifixion to a different day of the week, and hence that Saturday was never a Jewish Sabbath for over a year at any one time until after the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus;" that the Roman week "from before the birth of Christ to near the close of the fourth century

A. D. was eight days long, and hence that their Sabbaths changed forty-five times every year to a different day of the week;" and that Christ, "in fulfillment of prophecy, made the Sunday of his resurrection the Sabbath" which shall continue to the end and "become the Sabbath of all nations." Into the merits of Mr. Gamble's argument we may not enter. The titles of the successive chapters will, however, suggest the line of his discussion, as follows: "Brief Statement of Sabbath Doctrine," "Ancient Calendars and Ancient Methods of Sabbath Counting," "The True Bible Calendar," "Jewish Sabbaths, or the Sabbaths during the Jewish Dispensation," "Objections to the Jewish Sabbath Teachings Briefly Considered," "The Christian Sabbath Studied Negatively, or the Chief Arguments Against Sunday-Sabbath Observance Considered," and "The Christian Sabbath Positively, or the Christian Sabbath in Old Testament Prophecy and New Testament History." Besides his patient and scholarly treatment of the great subject under review, Mr. Gamble has inserted a chart which is as instructive as it is ingenious. His volume, whose Introduction is written by Bishop Fowler, deserves a place among the standard authorities.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Education and Life. By JAMES H. BAKER, LL.D. 12mo, pp. 254. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, $1.25.

Of these papers and addresses ten are under the head of "Education," and eight under the broader title. The first group includes a general view of the field, secondary education and its relation to the elementary and higher, some principles and problems of the elementary and secondary periods, higher education, and the practical bearing of all mental development. Such views as the following are presented: All education must be brought into closer touch with the work and the problems of to-day. The social aim in the preparation for citizenship must be given more prominence. Though mental power is the great need, it avails nothing without a content of knowledge. Because each field of knowledge has its own peculiar value the choice of studies during the period of general training is not matter of indifference. The studies in a given period should be good preparation for higher grades of work. The entire time between the first grade and college graduation must be shortened. We have suffered from false interpretation of the doctrines of pleasure, pursuit of inclination, punishment by merely natural consequences, and following lines of least resistance. A senior in college took for his electives Spanish, French, and lectures in music and art, merely because they were easiest—in the line of least resistance. A trenchant pen admonishes thus: "Soft pedagogics have taken the place of the old steep and rocky path to learning. But from this lukewarm air the bracing oxygen of effort is left out. It is nonsense to suppose that every step in education can be made interesting and pleasant." Prevailing educational methods give license to evasion, indolence, and dilettanteism.

In the presence of modern science both those who accept and those who refuse its teachings may agree to say, "Evolution must be interpreted, and the purpose of creation must be judged, not by the first struggle of a protozoan for food, but by the last aspiration and effort of man for heaven." Many fear that a practical, scientific age may destroy the poetry and romance of life. But Carlyle teaches truly that romance exists in reality, rather than in mythologies and fictions, "The thing that *is*, what else can be *so* wonderful?" And in a wonderful passage he adds: "In our own poor century man witnesses overhead the infinite deep, with lesser and greater lights, bright-rolling, silent-beaming, hurled forth by the hand of God; around him and under his feet the wonderfulest earth, with her winter snowstorms and summer spice airs, and (unaccountablest of all) *himself* standing here. He stands in the lapse of Time; he sees eternity behind him and before him." True and sure is the prophecy that the intellect of man will finally return from all its discoveries to say to the human soul: "Far and wide I have sought a basis for truth and found it not. Any philosophy that fails to recognize God is false. Search your inner consciousness. You are yourself God's highest creation. You see beauty in the flower and glory in the heavens; you have human love and sympathy and divine aspirations. Life to you is nothing without aim and hope. Trust your higher instincts!" In the chapter on "Plato's Philosophy" it is noted that Plato, regarding education, mental and moral, as the foundation of the state, wished to make it compulsory, and to give women the same training as men. These words are quoted from the conclusion of Plato's "Republic:" "My counsel is that we hold fast to the heavenly way and follow after justice and virtue always, considering that the soul is immortal. Thus shall we live, dear to one another and to the gods, both while remaining here and when like conquerors we go to receive our reward. And it shall be well with us both in this life and in the pilgrimage of a thousand years." Impressing the lesson that sentiment, feeling, and principle should culminate in action, the author says, "Do not allow your finer emotions to evaporate without finding expression in some useful act, if it is nothing but speaking kindly to your grandmother, or giving up your seat in a street car." He also says, "The whole curriculum of study, from the kindergarten to university graduation, should be a disclosure and impartation of ethical conceptions, a practice in right action, and an encouragement of right purpose." Our principal complaint against this book is that it overvalues State universities and fails to do justice to denominational colleges. A wholesome chapter is that on "The Modern Gospel of Work," which says truly that Edwin Markham's "Man with the Hoe" is wrong at the foundation, not correct science, nor good philosophy, nor accurate history. It regards labor as a curse; but without the hoe the human race would be chimpanzees, savages, tramps, criminals. In human development no useful labor ever "loosened and let down the brutal

jaw," or "slanted back the brow," or "blew out the light within the brain," or deprived man of his birthright. By cultivating the soil man cultivates his soul. The hoe has been an indispensable instrument to the growth of intelligence, morals, and manhood. The same chapter has the following: "It is a scientific fact that prayer is for the health of the soul. It is useless to theorize upon the subject—men pray because it is their nature; they cannot help it. The Christian experience shows that prayer is a communion of man's spirit with God, the Spirit. John Fiske affirms the reality of religion. He argues that the religious idea has played the dominant part in history; that *all the analogies of evolution show that man's religious nature cannot be an adjustment to an external nonreality;* and concludes thus: "Of all the implications of the doctrine of evolution with regard to man, the very deepest and strongest is that which asserts the Everlasting Reality of Religion. That this is a world in which science is possible proves it a rational world; and the natural inference is that it has a rational Creator." Professor T. H. Green writes: "*That God is,* Reason entitles us to say with *the same certainty as that the world is or that we ourselves are.* What He is, it does not, indeed, enable us to say in the same way in which we make propositions about matters of fact, but *it moves us to seek to become as He is, to become like Him, to become consciously one with Him, to have the fruition of His Godhead.* In this sense it is that Reason issues in the life of Faith." It requires greater credulity to call the Christian experience an illusion than to accept its reality and validity. Here are some significant expressions: "Faith is the X-ray of the soul;" "Those who are overcome in the struggle may have their reward; at Thermopylae the Persians won the laurels, but the Spartans the glory;" "When you see a man of marked power you may always be sure that he has used means of self-discipline and development which the average man neglects to use." Tennyson's son testifies to his great father's "splendid faith in the growing purpose of the sum of life, and in the noble destiny of the individual man;" to his belief that "it is the great purpose which consecrates life;" to his feeling that "only with his 'sword bathed in heaven,' can a man combat the cynical indifference, the intellectual selfishness, the sloth of will, utilitarian materialism of a transition age;" to his conviction that "the truth must be larger, purer, nobler than any mere human expression or comprehension of it;" and to his affirmation that "if you take away belief in the self-conscious personality of God, you take away the backbone of the world." What a testimony to the worth of prayer, and Church, and Sabbath is in these lines from Goethe:

> Once Heavenly Love sent down a burning kiss
> Upon my brow, in Sabbath silence holy;
> And, filled with mystic presage, chimed the church bells slowly,
> And prayer dissolved me in a fervent bliss,
> . . . . . .
> And, while a thousand tears were burning,
> I felt a world arise for me.

The Map of Life. By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. 12mo, pp. 353. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, $1.50.

An eminent historian of the philosophic type, in the late afternoon of life, records here the reflections which have arisen in his mind from a wide, long, patient survey of the human lot and character. It is a cool criticism of life and conduct, not overcynical for an old man—an unsentimental, unenthusiastic meditation, with something of Benjamin Franklin's practical philosophic temper. It begins with a discussion of happiness, defining it as a condition of mind, dependent on character and disposition more than on circumstances; the relation of health, and of morals, and of civilization to happiness; the importance of not making happiness the main object of pursuit, of seeking to avoid suffering rather than to attain pleasure, of filling life with work, and of remembering that the greatest pleasures are in spheres accessible to all. It is noted that improvement in character is more within our power than improvement of intellect, and that high moral qualities often go with low intellectual power; that progress in morals through centuries has been chiefly in the differing proportionate value attached to the various virtues. (Jesus set the world forward partly by exalting virtues and qualities which had been despised.) Lecky points out the reality of human depravity as illustrated by war, by the large amount of pure malevolence and cruel selfishness in the world, and by the mendacious and predacious practices of even civilized men. In several chapters he sets forth what he calls the necessity of moral compromise in life, and illustrates from history, with critical comments, the place which moral compromise has had in war, in the law, in politics, and in the Church. He discusses the ethics of war, its sufficient causes, lawful and unlawful methods of conducting it, the treatment of prisoners and of private property, and the binding force of a military oath. He reasons about a lawyer's temptations, how far an advocate may support a bad case, the license of cross-examination, and the defeating of justice by technicalities. He considers the difficulty of reconciling old formularies with changed beliefs, the growth of new ideas in the Church, modern ritualism and the sacerdotal spirit, how far clergymen may dissent from parts of a Church's theology and yet remain in it, the increasing sense of the relativity of belief, and the capacity of religion to undergo transformation. He emphasizes the necessity of training the will to mastery over desires and thoughts, showing its importance in all mental and moral culture. The difference in men, as to concentration and force, is largely a difference of will power. The last chapters treat of money, and marriage, and success, and time, and death. Speaking of the English, it is remarked that they do not dwell much on their emotions or indulge in free expression of them; demonstrations of sorrow or of joy are restrained; the custom of perpetuating grief by protracted mournings and by long retirement from the world is steadily diminishing. Similarly, English Protestantism lays less stress on the inner feelings than on

action; it discourages the habit of minute introspection which the Romish confessional promotes, which is so prominent in the writings of Catholic saints and of other mystics; and it regards improved conduct and the active service of worthy causes as the most trustworthy measures of spiritual progress. Speaking of the curious ways in which men seek and find enjoyment, it is narrated that Lord Althorp, near the end of his long parliamentary career, declared that the thing that had given him the greatest pleasure in life was to see sporting dogs hunt; which reminds us of a man, known to us, who lived eighty-five years, of whom his own son wrote with filial pride that the principal aim of his father's long life had been the improvement of his dogs; which recalls the woman whose relations with the cosmos were described thus, "Herself first, her pet dog a bad second, and the rest of the world nowhere." What low and trivial aims engage mankind, who ought to rise so high! Lecky does not agree with the antivivisectionists who oppose experiments on living animals and who would thus close the best hope of finding remedies for some of the worst forms of human suffering. Speaking of statesmanship, it is truly said that, under free institutions, the true statesman must be able to discern the people's wish; as a French writer puts it, "The great art consists not in hearing those who speak, but in hearing those who are silent;" not in listening to intrusive, self-seeking, ambitious, and voluble politicians, but in knowing what the *people* think and want, and then executing the people's will "as lightnings do the will of God." It was Lincoln's habit when the politicians were babbling and whispering to him, to lay his ear to the ground for the murmur of the will of the great American public. Sometimes he called Matthew Simpson from his constant mingling with men in all parts of the Union to tell him what the people were saying among themselves about the course of the government. The friends of the President now in the White House, who has been called "an opportunist" and accused of having no policy, point out that in this respect he is like Lincoln, conceiving his duty to be not to execute his own will and preference, but to obey the will of the people, after having taken all possible pains to ascertain what that will, from time to time, is. Pertinent, just here, are Lecky's words about a statesman's difficulty in steering his way between rival fanaticisms—"the fanatics who pardon everything if it succeeds and conduces to the pride of empire, and who act as if weak powers and savage nations had no moral rights; and the fanatics who seem to have a leaning against their own country, and who imagine that in times of war, anarchy, or rebellion, and in dealing with savage or half-savage military populations, it is possible to act with the same respect to the technicalities of law, and the same invariable high standard of scrupulousness, as in a peaceful age and a highly civilized country." The present German emperor is censured for hastening to Constantinople, so soon after the Armenian massacres, to clasp the Sultan's hand, so deeply stained

with innocent Christian blood, and then proceeding to the Mount of Olives to proclaim himself, with melodramatic piety, the patron and champion of the Christian faith! Our author says that the scientific doctrine of evolution is in no degree inconsistent with the belief either in a Divine and Creative origin of things or in a settled and Providential plan. Concerning the roominess of the Church of England, Lecky writes: "There are to be found within it men whose opinions can hardly be distinguished from Deism or Unitarianism, and men who abjure the name of Protestant and are only divided by the thinnest partition from the Romish Church. And this diversity exists in a Church which is held together by articles and formularies of the sixteenth century." Speaking of the efficacy of Christian Churches in promoting that spiritual life which, whatever men may say of it, is at least one of the great realities of human nature, the author says: "The power of a religion is *not* to be mainly judged by its corporate action, by the institutions it creates, or by the part it plays in the government of the world. It is to be found much more in its action on the individual soul, and especially in those times and circumstances when man is most isolated from society. It is in furnishing the ideals and motives of individual life; in guiding and purifying the emotions; in promoting habits of thought and feeling which rise above the things of earth; in the comfort it can give in age, sorrow, disappointment, and bereavement; in seasons of sickness, weakness, declining faculties, and approaching death, that its power is most felt. No one creed or Church has a monopoly of this power, though each has often tried to identify it with something peculiar to itself. It may be found in the Catholic and in the Quaker, in the High Anglican who attributes it to his sacramental system, and in the Evangelical in whose eyes that system holds only a very subordinate place." He thinks that religion's deepest roots are less in the reason of man than in his sorrows and his affections, and that religion is preeminently "the expression of wants, moral appetites, and spiritual aspirations, which are an essential, indestructible part of his nature." How life's needs are in league with the preacher to press men toward religion, is indicated in this passage: "Young men often discuss religious questions simply as matters of intellectual debate; but later in life they more frequently accept their creed as a working hypothesis of life; as a consolation in innumerable calamities; as the one supposition under which life is not a melancholy anticlimax; as the indispensable sanction of moral obligation; as the reflection and gratification of needs, instincts, and longings which are planted in the deepest recesses of human nature; as one of the chief pillars on which society rests." Our author shows his ignorance in accepting as a fact the alleged tendency of the children of clergymen to go conspicuously to the bad. No slander can be more easily and completely disproved by investigation anywhere and everywhere; for it has been conclusively ascertained that no other class of children so generally show a strong tendency to go

conspicuously to the good and to rise to positions of eminent usefulness and honor. We end this notice of a generally judicious book with this touching epitaph from a German churchyard: "I will arise, O Christ, when thou callest me; but O! let me rest awhile, for I am very weary!"

Modern Methods of Church Work. By Rev. GEORGE WHITEFIELD MEAD. 12mo, pp. 363. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. Price, cloth, $1.50.

This book, though not just from the press, is as valuable as on the day of its first issue. There is a prevalent feeling among all Churches that some old methods of Christian work are now unsuitable and ineffective. Results from their use are not satisfactory. In the business world methods are changed continually to meet changed conditions. The conditions amid which the Church labors for its success change also, and the same alertness, inventiveness, and readiness to employ new methods and agencies, are required if any hope of success is to be entertained. No Church ought to be less tied up to mere custom and form, and more vigilant and quick to vary and improve its methods, than our own; for Methodism began as an almost revolutionary innovation in methods and plans of work, amid a storm of criticism from the custodians of customs and precedents. Our Church should always allow room for the spontaneous play of versatile inventive genius eagerly bent on adapting means to ends for the solving of problems and the salvation of men. Let there be liberty for ardent and intrepid men to try all sorts of decent expedients. Let us not find fault with methods because they are new. Agile adaptability to an infinite variety of situations and populations has characterized Methodism. Let us exact of Christian workers zeal and success; to this end let us leave them free as to methods, not tying them up with the red-tape of custom. We are the servants and imitators of a God who "fulfills himself in many ways." The Introduction in the book before us refers to the magnificent adventurousness of those great days when the Wesleys broke through all precedents and horrified a conventionalized Church by their unprecedented and unsanctioned methods of going after the multitudes to reach and gain, and save them. Their marvelous success was their overwhelming vindication. With a sacrificial spirit as changeless as the purpose of Christ to save the world, the Church's ways of working must be flexible to fit every new occasion. The spirit of the free workman, impatient of restraints and hampers, is typified in Phillips Brooks chafing against the rubrics, dashing down the Prayer Book that he might, upon occasion, pour out the hot, tumultuous, unlimited passion of his sanctified soul in spontaneous prayer, and discarding his sacerdotal robes at times that he might stand and talk directly, as man to man upon the street, as brother conversing appealingly with brothers on a level, unisolated by peculiar garb. This is a timely book; it will help to make a larger one like it necessary in a decade. It tells of a large variety of methods which have been tried by various workers of various communions, in different places, and fully

describes them. Many experiments are being tried, risking mistakes on the basis of the conviction of Frederick W. Robertson when he said, "He is not the best Christian or the best general who makes the fewest mistakes; but he is the best who makes the most splendid victories by learning wisdom from his mistakes and retrieving his false steps." The greatest of all mistakes is not to try other methods when any given method fails. These forty-four chapters present a large volume of instructive, suggestive, and stimulating information, which it will profit any Christian minister or layman to read and study. The range of subjects is extensive: "The Free, the Open, and the Institutional Church," "Reaching People Outside the Church," "Reaching Strangers at the Services," "The Ushers," "The Choir," "Men's Clubs," "The Sunday Evening Service," "The After Meeting," "The Pleasant Sunday Afternoon," "Young People's Societies," "Prayer Meetings," "Cottage Prayer Meetings," "Open-Air Preaching," "Rural Evangelization," "Reaching and Holding Young Men," "Reading-Rooms, Literary Societies, and Entertainment Courses," "Women's Work," "Work with Girls and Young Women," "The Social Problem of the Church," "The Children of the Church," "The Sunday School," "Lectures to Boys Only," "The Boys' Club," "The Boys' Brigade," "Industrial Classes," "Kindergartens," "Temperance Work," "Dispensaries," "Diet Kitchens," "Deaconesses," "Beneficiary and Loan Associations," "The Plural Pastorate," "The Free-Pew and Voluntary-Offering System," "Church Programmes, Bulletins, and Advertising," "Church Architecture, New Styles," "Results of New Methods." A mere glance at this enumeration of new agencies and instrumentalities must impress the most superficial reader with the immense fertility and intense activity of the Christian Church, and so inspire hope for the future. Yet alertness, consecration, and energetic effort are far from being as prominent and prevalent in Zion as they should be, and there is still in many places too much reason for deploring, with Phillips Brooks, the "awful sluggishness of Christendom," the "terrible torpidity of the Christian Church," and for praying with him that "God may come near to us this very year and give us a great, true revival of religion."

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

A History of Babylonia and Assyria. By ROBERT WILLIAM ROGERS, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S., Professor in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey. 2 volumes, 8vo, pp. xx, 429, xv, 418. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. Price, cloth, $5.

The science of one of the most ancient of historical subjects is still young. It was the University of Berlin that first gave recognition to the science of Assyriology, by creating a chair and appointing to it Eberhard Schrader, an Old Testament scholar, who was the first man in all the world to become Professor of Assyriology. It is interesting to note

how much this modern science owes to its first professor. Schrader's pupils are his testimonial and his crown. Out of his class room came Friedrich Delitzsch, the philologist, who wrote the first complete Assyrian grammar and made the first complete Assyrian dictionary. Delitzsch transmitted the impulse received from Schrader to one of his own pupils, Fritz Hommel, of Munich, who issued at Berlin, in 1885, an important *History of Babylonia and Assyria.* It was also under the inspiration of Schrader's exposition of the historical value of modern oriental discoveries that Dr. C. P. Tiele, a theological professor in the University of Holland, published at Gotha, in 1886, his *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte.* Then, in 1892, another of Schrader's pupils, Hugo Winckler, wrote a suggestive and ingeniously speculative book, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens.* And now comes Robert W. Rogers, also, be it noted, one of Schrader's pupils, with a history supplementing the others and in many items correcting them with his fuller and later knowledge—a history worthy to rank with either of the three great books above mentioned, and surpassing them in some important and easily noticed particulars. Of *scientific* books devoted *exclusively* to the history of Babylonia and Assyria, Hommel, Tiele, and Winckler had, until now, produced the three most notable, to which this work of Professor Rogers may be said to add itself as the fourth in line, extending, rectifying, and completing up to date the work of his predecessors. This is not saying that there are not other books of value touching the history of Babylonia and Assyria, but they treat that history in connection with the history of other oriental peoples, and generally with other than purely historical purpose. Of the three great works above named, Hommel's is nearest akin to, and most natural to be compared with, this new work by Professor Rogers. One of the chief values of Hommel's work is its good account of the discovery and decipherment of inscriptions, of which there is no account whatever in Tiele or Winckler. But Hommel's account extends only to 1885, and fills only seventy-seven pages, while Rogers's account is to 1900 and occupies two hundred and fifty-three pages. Hommel has nothing at all about the decipherment of Vannic or Chaldian texts and very little about the Sumerian question, upon which Professor Rogers gives in chapter vii, Vol. I, what Professor Sayce pronounces "a clear and admirable summary." Moreover Hommel often refers only second hand to early documents to which he had no access, while Rogers has examined and diligently studied them all, so that his references to them are all at first hand. Hommel's account of early discovery begins with Pietro della Valle about 1618 A. D.; but Dr. Rogers shows (Vol. I, pp. 3–5) that it really began with Odoric about 1320 A. D., and besides adds to those previously known to Hommel the names of Barbaro, Antonio de Gouvea, and Don Garcia de Sylva y Figueroa. These last and other items of value in the book before us have been noticed and credited by Dr. William Hayes Ward, director of the Wolfe expedition to Babylonia (which went from New York in 1884, its expenses being defrayed by Miss Cath-

arine L. Wolfe), especial praise being also given to Professor Rogers's account of the dynasties and successive rulers of Babylonia and Assyria, the story of which is graphically told and the relation to Egyptian and Jewish history well brought out. *The Independent*, of which Dr. Ward is editor, says, "We are compelled to pay tribute to the faithfulness of investigation, the largeness of view, the breadth of knowledge, the general soundness of critical discernment, and the succinct compactness by which a large field is brought within reasonable compass in this eminently readable book." Professor Gilmore, of Meadville Theological School, in *The New World* for December, 1900, noting many excellences in this book, says that the data for the chronology of the subject have never been better set forth. Not only is this true, but it is a fact that never before has *all* the chronological material been assembled in one place, annotated, explained, and sifted. This unprecedented achievement is in Vol. I, chapter xii. Professor Gilmore says that a serviceable bibliography of the best books in English on Babylonian and Assyrian history would be Maspero's three huge volumes, *Dawn of Civilization*, *Struggle of the Nations*, and *Passing of the Empires;* McCurdy's work, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments* (the third volume of which will soon be noticed in our pages, as the previous volumes have been); and these two volumes by Robert W. Rogers. As to the style in which this book is written, it should be said that scientific works do not aim at rhetoric or literary elegance, and that much use of foreign languages, ancient and modern, with constant translating of archæological inscriptions, might well result in an un-English style. But while Dr. Rogers has lived much with the modern languages which have given him immediate access to the European literature of his subject, and also with Assyrian, his mastery of which is shown by the scholarship in cuneiform contained in his book, yet Professor Gilmore justly commends our author's style, which is most effective for its purpose, being not cumbrous, but characterized by short, direct, lucid sentences, and free from obscure periods. It is widely known that few if any men have such power to interest audiences by lectures on ancient historical themes as Professor Rogers manifests in making archæological research and discovery seem perfectly fascinating even to uninstructed hearers who might be expected to find such subjects dull; and he has written his history similarly, in a vivid and living way. It is impossible not to notice that the book is a marvel of condensation. Dr. Talcott Williams, himself an orientalist, says that our author stands among the few who have made a vast field accessible to the general public; that in these two laborious and exhaustive volumes an inestimable service has been rendered by collating what is valuable from an enormous amount of matter scattered in hundreds of publications relating to a period of history twice as long as the Christian era, and by adding new matter from some fields in which the author is an original and independent investigator. In this, continues Dr. Williams, American scholarship presents an achievement which is of the

highest usefulness. *The Critic* for March, 1901, noticing the extraordinary power of condensation, of which we are speaking, says that, in Dr. Rogers's book, the gist of volumes sometimes lies in four lines of a footnote. The necessity for compression would alone prevent an elaborate or graceful style; but such a style, as already remarked, is not to be expected, nor even desired, in a scientific work like the one before us. And it may not be amiss to say that this power to go through vast accumulations of matter on any great subject, judging each item and opinion with a sifting judgment, rejecting the nonessential and retaining the essential, and finally compressing the whole result of the sifting and selecting process into a nutshell in a masterful way, is one of the supreme tests of intellectual ability. The strong minds have a monopoly of the process of mental distillation. Rogers's *History of Babylonia and Assyria* could not have been made without the fine enthusiasm of the genuine scholar, which nerves to arduous undertakings and sustains through long and exhausting labors, nor without the acuteness of mind and tireless patience which qualify for successful research, nor without the conservatism of the trained historical critic. This notice may well conclude by quoting *The New World's* reference to the appearance of these volumes, which is a deserved tribute to our publishing house: "We have as usual to speak well of the publisher's part. The Methodist Book Concern, with its large and constant *clientèle*, can afford new type, excellent paper, good sewing, substantial covers, careful proof reading; and it furnishes them. These volumes are no discredit even to them."

The Clergy in American Life and Letters. By DANIEL DULANY ADDISON. 12mo. pp. 400. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, $1.25.

How typical of the reckless insolence of infidelity that Thomas Paine should have told George Washington to his face, "You are treacherous in private friendship and a hypocrite in public life!" How easy the task of this volume to show that the clergy have exercised a mighty uplifting influence upon American life from the first! "If Christianity has been a power in the land in developing conscience and inspiring rectitude of character, it has been due in large measure to the ministers. They have had a hearing in every hamlet—on one day in seven when the children, the ignorant, and the men of education and of power have heard them. They have thus sustained a sense of the divine source of duty, and led their hearers into the presence of universal moral forces." Our colleges and schools were originated by them. Every great reform has been led by them, and every noble cause has found in them its spokesmen and pleaders. The children reared in their homes have filled the highest spheres of usefulness and power. Among the colonial clergy of New England were many rugged yet beautiful characters whose influence controlled the life of the region. A typical man was Ezra Stiles, elected president of Yale College in 1777, a learned scholar in Arabic, Syriac, and Persian, who at Commencement sometimes deliv-

ered a Hebrew oration in the morning and a Latin one in the afternoon. He hesitated about accepting the college presidency, saying, "The diadem of a president is a crown of thorns." Abiel Holmes, of Cambridge, in whose library the boy, Oliver Wendell, bumped about among folios as tall as himself, was a man of note, wise, delightful, and sunny, though the boy remembered some ministerial visitors to his father's house "with meager throats and a funeral service in their physiognomies." Samuel Hopkins, taught in Jonathan Edwards's household, softened the sterner features of his master's teaching, giving greater prominence to the equity of God and the beauty of holiness; but his most memorable work was against slavery, against which he fulminated before the nineteenth century came in. When he first startled his congregation in Newport by urging the setting free of the slaves, Whittier truly says, "It may well be doubted whether on that Sabbath day the angels of God, in their wide survey of the universe, looked upon a nobler spectacle than that of the minister of Newport, rising up before his slaveholding congregation and demanding, in the name of the Highest, the deliverance of the captive." Among the clergy in theological literature, in recent years, Charles Hodge is a name of note, his chief monument being his *Systematic Theology*, a comprehensive work in four parts, embracing theology, anthropology, soteriology, and eschatology, with no attempt at originality. He said proudly that "Princeton had never been charged with originating a new idea," in a pride like that of Dr. Shedd, when he said concerning his own book, "There is not a new thing in it—nothing less than several hundred years old." Worthy to stand in ability beside Hodge are Elisha Mulford's two remarkable books, *The Nation* and *The Republic of God*. The latter, called "An Institute of Theology," deals with reasons for the being of God, and the relations of religion and philosophy to the revelation of God, the Incarnation, the redemption of the world, and the life of the spirit. It presents a complete survey of the noblest conceptions of humanity, history, and the Christian religion, with all the aid to be received from a frank acceptance of the scientific contributions to theology. It comes nearest of American books to being a systematic treatment of Christianity in the light of modern thought. The main features of Mulford's theology are the indwelling of the Spirit of God in humanity and Christ's organic relations with man, the Incarnation being the natural revelation in history of the character of God. Sin is bondage to the order of nature, and redemption is the elevation of the soul into the life of the spirit. After giving four chapters to the influence of the clergy in American life, and as writers of history, poetry, romance, and religious literature, the book before us gives six to as many conspicuous figures of the American pulpit, selecting Timothy Dwight, William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, Horace Bushnell, Henry Ward Beecher, and Phillips Brooks. From these studies a few morsels are taken. A painful affection of the eyes for many years compelled the first President Timothy Dwight

to dictate letters, sermons, poems, everything he committed to paper, resulting in a style described by Moses Coit Tyler as "composition by the tongue, rather than the pen; the style of an eloquent declaimer with the audience before him; clever improvisation—affluent, emphatic, sonorous, moving on in balanced numbers." Young Channing was for a short time tutor in a family at Richmond, Virginia, where he much enjoyed Southern warmth and hospitality, writing home: "Here I find great vices, but virtues greater than I left behind me. There is one single trait in these people which I admire more than all the virtues of New England; they love money less, they are more disinterested." But he found slavery very depressing, and said, "This alone would prevent me from settling in Virginia." Urging earnestness of manner in the pulpit, Channing once said: "I do not mean that a minister must have lungs of iron and a voice of thunder. Noise and earnestness are very different things. I only mean that a minister should deliver his message as if he felt its infinite weight, and this he may do without being a brawler." Of Channing, Theodore Parker wrote, "A most delightful man, full of the right spirit—a little diseased in the region of consciousness, but otherwise of most remarkable beauty of character." Horace Bushnell describes the humble home where he was born, as one of those "primitive universities of homespun," where hard manual labor was dignified by sturdy character and religious training. In Europe for health, Bushnell noted that Lord John Russell in Parliament said "havin'" and "walkin';" and that Thiers was a most enthusiastic orator, "gesturing up and down with both hands as fast as he could." One of the civic questions on which Bushnell did warlike service was the appropriation of public moneys to parochial schools. Such schools, he held, were no more than private schools, and it would be unwise and wrong to give money from the public funds to private institutions. It might be demanded next that the State appropriate money for schools to teach the Mormon Bible. When some one remarked concerning a certain humdrum, sluggish preacher, "I knew him when he was a boy doing chores for his board," Bushnell commented, "That's what he's doing now." Of Bushnell, Austin Phelps said, "He was a looker on and up, to the firmament of truth, and whatever he saw there he proclaimed to the waiting multitudes below." It is fortunate that Henry Ward Beecher early got out of staid New England and was flung out into the freer, rough, leaping, pioneering West. The life of saddle-bags, and river fording, and schoolhouses, and camp meetings in which he shared, had much to do with developing his mighty youth and rousing his great powers to free and natural action. But for this, there would never have been a "Lion of Plymouth Pulpit." It was the Western wilderness that taught him to shake his mane and let out his roar. In the little settlement of Lawrenceburg, Ohio, was his first parish, of which he has told: "I was my own sexton. There were no lamps in the church, so I bought some, and filled them and lit them. I swept the

building and kindled the fire. The only reason I did not ring the bell was that there was none to ring." All his life he laid great stress on the importance to the preacher of health, sleep, and the open air. We once heard him say: "If I reach home on Saturday, tired with travel and work, I do not go to my study; I go to bed, and sleep as long as I can, if it is till thirty minutes to church time Sunday morning. Then I can make more and better preparation with a rested brain in fifteen minutes, than I could have done by cudgelling a tired brain for twelve hours in my study." He urged a certain healthful bravery in preaching, saying, "A congregation knows when a minister is afraid of them, just as well as a horse knows that his driver is afraid of him." Of some sermons he said they were built like the ships down in Maine: "They build them by the mile, and when they have an order they cut off as much as is required, and round off a stern and a bow. Thus some sermons seem to have been built by the mile; there seems to be no earthly reason why the preacher should begin in one place rather than in another." Dr. Holmes said, "The way a man handles his egotisms is a test of his mastery over an audience." Beecher was as frank as a great child, but his egotisms were never used for self-glorification, but only to illustrate and vivify the truth he was unfolding. How just was his tribute to the spiritualizing and hallowing influence of the much maligned Puritan Sabbath: "The one great poem of New England is her Sabbath. Through that she has escaped materialism. That has been the crystal dome overhead through which imagination has been kept alive. The glory of New England's imagination is to be found —not in art or literature—but in her inventions, her social organism, and, above all, in her religious life." Of Puritanism Phillips Brooks, the last great figure in this volume, said with similar admiration: "There is always showing itself out of the depths of Puritanism that great public spirit which meddles with the things of all the earth and which will show its force when that force is called for. It stands like a rusty gun in a corner of the room; but let no one ever fool with Puritanism, thinking it is not loaded, for by and by it will go off." Brooks spoke of Luther and Cromwell as the two men "on whom, more than on any others, the great gates seem to turn and open which let the race through from the old world into the new." When Phillips Brooks was a college boy at Harvard his tastes were for history, languages, poetry, with marked inability for mathematics and metaphysics. His first attempt in active life was as teacher in the Boston Latin School, and a most dismal failure. The head master, Francis Gardner, received his resignation with the severe and disheartening remark that he had never known a man who failed as a schoolmaster to succeed in any other occupation. And then the hand of Providence led the mortified young giant away by the path of humiliation toward his holy mission and his illustrious destiny. A bitter dose of mortification is sometimes a good tonic to begin with. One of the secrets of this great preacher's

power was the unity, the intensity, the concentrated coaction of all his powers in all he did. This is in his words, "Truth, when it is won, is the possession of *the whole nature*. By the *whole nature* only can it be gained;" and also in these, "I have done my work, so far, not as mere headwork, but as the completest possible expression of my personal being that I am capable of." There it is! And when he spoke, the passion of his whole being drove the words, and every drop of his blood went with the force of what he said. Our readers see that this is an interesting and inspiring book.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Bible Tragedies. By GEORGE CLARKE PECK. 12mo, pp. 172. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. Price, cloth, $1.

The son of Dr. J. O. Peck dedicates to his mother this vivid volume of Sunday evening sermons, and sends them forth, he says, "diffidently, yet with the earnest hope of diminishing the tragedies which fill a father's heart with sorrow and a beautiful world with gloom." Any reader of them (and they deserve many) must feel that they are eminently, one might say singularly, calculated to do what the author hopes. Dr. Mains says truly in his "Introductory Word" that these discourses are illuminated with a wealth of illustrative material drawn from fresh and vital sources, abound in vivid and pointed lessons for practical living, and contain nothing hackneyed. One is not surprised that they were eagerly listened to by crowded congregations. The eight Bible tragedies here discoursed about are those of "The Forbidden Fruit," "The Quails," "The Spoil," "The Unseen Hand," "An Ancient Gallows," "A Charger," "The Uninvested Pound," and "The Silver Pieces." The sermons are forcible and faithful, driven by the push of an enkindled mind and an earnest heart. The purpose to save and help men and women burns manifestly through them all. Their scholarship does not make them academic, their theology does not skeletonize them, their familiarity with literature does not make them bookish, their knowledge of history does not antiquate or make them mindful chiefly of the dead past. All these are only used as implements for touching immediately, movingly, and helpfully the throbbing, struggling, and imperiled human lives of the men and women and young people now sitting in the pews before the preacher. These urgent, incisive, and appealing utterances do not belong to such a ministry as is thus described: "I have heard men preach whose deliverances seemed set to music. They had all the equipment that earth can offer. They were engaged in the most wonderful work that human hands can touch—teaching human hearts the way of life. And yet their ministries were 'sweetness wasted.' They carried no citadels of sin. For they came to their work without that spiritual equipment which alone can qualify a man to preach his Master's Gospel."

1 4581